

A 4256. c. 19.

TREATISE

OF

Mr. Cottons,

Clearing certaine DOUBTS
Concerning

PREDESTINATION.

Together with

AN EXAMINATION

Thereof; written by

William Twisse, D D.

Pastor of Newbury.


Prov. 19. 21. *There are many devices in mans heart; neverthe-
lesse the counsell of the Lord that shall stand.*

2 Cor. 4. 3. *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.*

LONDON,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Andrew Crook*, and are to be sold
at his Shop at the Signe of the *Green Dragon* in
Pauls Church-yard. 1646.





The Authors Epistle unto the Reader.

I*T was my purpose and resolution at the first,* so let this piece, in answer to Mr. Cotton, passe without a preface; for it was put into a Stationers hand ere I was aware: Neither did I see the mans face untill the whole book was printed. And for certaine yeares I knew not what was become of it, which I imputed to the confusion of these times. But so it was, that a Knight of our County, sent over unto mee the Minister who lived in his house, to intreate me to communicate unto him my answer to a book, intituled, Gods love to mankind: which I condescended unto; willing to satisfie so noble a friend as Sir Francis Pile. The Minister perceiving this answer of mine to Mr. Cotton lying with it, desired that hee might take that also along with him, that Sir Francis might have a sight of that together with the other: whereunto I yielded, upon promise made, that both pieces should be returned into my hands very shortly, within a moneth or two.

But evill times followed not long after, and for a whole year we were full of distractions in the Countrey. My chiefest care was, for the preservation of my manuscripts, which I brought with me to London at the first: But this piece in answer to Mr. Cotton was wanting; I had utterly for-

The Epistle to the Reader.

gotten what was become of it. Sir Francis removed to Southampton, and took care of my copies to have them along with him. It was somewhat long ere they were brought to London; but in good time they arrived here safe and sound. And Mr. Gilbert, who brought me the first word of it, shewed me withall that he was well acquainted with a Stationer, who would undertake for the setting forth my Answer to Gods love to mankind: Omely his desire was, he might begin with the printing of my answer to Mr. Cotton, because that was a small piece. And thus ere I was aware, I came to understand, that my stray sheep, which I gave for lost, was found.

And since that, considering certaine passages of divine providence, causing some interruption in the proceedings of bringing forth this Treatise unto the light of the presse: I have been moved thereby to prefixe this preface, partly on mine owne behalfe, and partly on the behalfe of Mr. Cotton: For men may perhaps conceive me to be well pleased with an adversative disposition, and to affect a course of opposition, as well to the friends of the Bridegroome, as to his enemies: As if I were like Ismael in part, of whom it was said, that his hand was against every ones; which is enough to make me like unto him in the other part also, and provoke every one to have his hand against me. Truth it is, all my writings, both printed and manuscript, that have an eye towards the presse, are of a responsorious nature; but the originall motive cause unto me was meerely mine owne satisfaction, and that in the points of grace and predestination. In arguments of this nature, I promised to my selfe more comfort then I could expect in studying Transubstantiation, or Purgatory. And because truth is never sufficiently known in a scholasticall way, unlesse we are able to master the strongest

The Epistle to the Reader.

est oppositions that are made against it; therefore I gave my selfe to take notice of the greatest sticklers in their oppositions against that doctrine, which is maintained by our Divines: and all this meerely for mine own better progression in the investigation of truth, without the least thought at that time of publishing ought. And for the same cause I set my selfe upon those passages, which seemed to containe the greatest difficultie: And therefore in examining Arminius, I began in the midst of his answer to Mr. Perkins, to ponder well his digression and discourse about divine permission; for in that argument I had found no small difficultie; and I made tryall, whether by that discourse of his I could find satisfaction; but I found no satisfaction at all from him; neither was I able to worke out sufficient satisfaction to my selfe: about that matter was the first digression I began with, but it was one of the last that I finished.

Other discourses of mine, many of them, yea, most of them, were written by me onely at the instance of others. My answer to Mr. Hords discourse (which since is printed with Mr. Simons additions, and set forth under the specious title of Gods love to mankind;) was performed by me at the request of Sir Nathaniell Rich. My answer to the Synod of Dort, after reduced to practise, was penned by me to satisfie friends, two copies thereof manuscript being sent unto me from scholar-friends in Oxford: but especially I was glad, that I had so good an opportunitie thereby to quiet the spirit of my lord Say, his honour being not a little moved with the scoffing carriage of Tilenus, the Author of that piece (who dyed shortly after as I was advertised) and by his lordships honourable care it was brought forth to light. I could give the like account of many other pieces written by me, and imployed therein by others; many of them being

The Epistle to the Reader.

as meane in condition as my selfe. This very piece of Mr. Cottons, the answer whereunto is now put forth, I undertooke meerely upon the motion of Mr. Bets, a young Minister, who at that time lived at Broughton, in the house of my lord Say: he intreated me to take it into consideration, and shew my judgement concerning it: And to gratifie him I undertooke it; and my lord Say himselfe liked well of it, and communicated it unto Mr. Cotton, who carried it with him into New-England; whereby I was put to my shifis to get a copy of it as I could for mine owne use.

Now concerning Mr. Cotton, it may be his reputation will seeme to be touched in this; but let the indifferent Reader consider what I say in my observation. Both Austin and other great Divines have written freely and largely of Election, but very sparingly of Reprobation; the reason whereof I conceive to be this, There appeares more seeming offensive harshnesse in the doctrine of Reprobation, then in the doctrine of Election. Secondly, I am perswaded, they manifestly perceived, that by stating the doctrine aright in the point of Election, the truth, by just analogy and proportion, did there-hence necessarily follow in the point of Reprobation, to all judicious Divines. Now Mr. Cotton, as I have heard, is very sound and orthodox in the point of Election; and comes to this work with a gracious intent, to clear the doctrine of Predestination (and that in the speciall of Reprobation) from such harsh consequences as seeme to be derived there-hence; which doe very frequently break forth, as I have observed, when the order of Gods decrees is not stated aright: And by experience I have found the manifold odious imputations of strange harshnesse layd upon Gods proceedings, and represented by the Remonstrants in their Antisynodalia Doradacena, in number 10. as I remember; but they all vanish and come

The Epistle to the Reader.

to nothing upon the right ordering of Gods decrees : wherein, if any Divine faile, it may be his failing is only in a point of Logick, provided that he be orthodox in the point of grace, but if he be corrupt in that, then the more corrupt his Logick is, the better it may serve his turn for the countenancing of his erroneous wayes in matter of divinity.

Lastly, I have been given to understand by Mr. Simson, one of the reverend Divines of the Assembly, that Mr. Cotton upon the receiving and perusing this treatise of mine, seemed to be moved therewith not a little, and that in such a way, as not to be provoked thereby, but rather to incline to the receiving of satisfaction. Mr. Cotton is a Divine whom I never saw, but so much I have heard of his pietie and parts of learning, that his name shall ever be of reverend remembrance with me. Nevertheless, because this discourse of his, wherunto I adresse my answer, is in the hands of many, and some of them may be strengthened in their erroneous wayes, by this writing of his, and I have heard, that certaine Arminians have taken advantage, to justifie them in their wayes, from some passages in this very discourse of Mr. Cottons : Others, though orthodox, may hereby be misled into error, in such sort, as to corrupt both themselves and their brethren into such opinions (too pleasing unto flesh and bloud) as may shake the orthodox doctrine of Gods free grace, in the precious points of Election, Predestination, & Regeneration. This danger I desire to prevent, and upon my knowledge, my labour and paines herein have bin taken in very good part, by those who are the very good friends of Mr. Cotton, and some not his good friends onely, but great and right well approved of by Mr. Cotton himselfe, they have deserved no lesse as his hands. The God of all grace, bring all his into an unitie of faith, in the acknowledgement of his grace, which is the onely sure way unto glory.



Faults in Printing correct thus.

Page 6. line 15. if. read of. p. 10. l. 1. thus, r. this. p. 11. l. 15. contradictions, r. contradictory. p. 27. l. 18. Apostle, r. Epistle. p. 33. l. 1. r. what was Gods. p. 38. l. 29. Question the 2. it should be Doubt the third: the want whereof made us suspect that the whole and intire Answer to the third Doubt was missing. p. 39. l. last save one, hen, r. when. p. 40. l. last save one, confesseth, r. confesse. p. 43. l. 21. bought, r. brought. p. 52. l. 15. decrees to save, r. decree was to save. p. 57. l. the last, distinct, r. disjunct. p. 61. l. 33. distinct, r. disjunct. p. 76. l. 18. grants, r. grant. p. 87. l. 9. after the word *seigne* there should be such a disjunction as this [;] p. 98. l. 12. objects, r. objection. p. 114. l. the fourth from the end, controversies but; read it thus, controversies; but. p. 117. l. 16. manner, r. nature. p. 131. l. 18. rash, r. harsh. l. 19. rash, r. harsh. p. 182. l. 9. in his his purposes, r. in Gods purpose. p. 190. l. 27. r. obduration. p. 194. l. 17. like, r. life. p. 199. l. 26. objection, r. Objection. p. 207. the fifth Doubt, Question the fifth, line the sixth and seventh seems to be obscure; but yet compared with the former, and well considered, the mist will break up, and the sense of the Author appeare. p. 209. l. 4. mans, r. man. p. 225. l. the fourth from the end, serves, r. seems. p. 227. l. 30. leave out the word *and*. p. 234. l. 30. effectually, r. and effectually. p. 236. l. the last, r. informe him. p. 237. l. 29. that without, leave out the word that. p. 239. l. 6. short of, r. short of them. p. 250. l. 3. speciall, r. specials. l. 13. Genius, r. genus. p. 254. l. 15. it, r. in. p. 255. Quest. 7. l. 10. of a grace, r. of grace. p. 267. l. 17. naturalls should, r. naturalls right, should. p. 283. l. 20. *aget*, r. *aget*. p. 284. the last line save five, sounding, reade soundnesse.



AN EXAMINATION

of a Treatise written by Master
Cotton, for the clearing of certaine
doubts concerning *Predestination*.

QUESTION. I.

HOW may it appeare that there was any thought
of the incarnation of the second person, or ad-
vancement of the man Christ, before the pre-
supposall of the fall of man, and his owne
humiliation.

*God doth not propose one thing before another in time, all things
are at once present with him: But the things purposed by God, God
doth order them one for another, and so is he rightly said to purpose
one thing in order before another. Now in order of things, God hath
first purposed the glorifying of himselfe, yea, and the glorifying of
himselfe in Christ too, before he presupposed the fall of man, and
humiliation of Christ; as may appeare, &c.* *Ans.*

I. I will first take into consideration the doubt proposed. Here
are foure things mentioned: and the Question is made touching
the priority of the two first in respect of the two latter, and that
in the thoughts (or intention) of God. And withall I conceive
the incarnation of the Sonne of God is considered in reference to
the fall of man. And the advancement of the man Christ in refe-
rence to his humiliation. Of the *Priority* of each in respect of his
correlative proceeds the doubt. I thinke good to consider them
apart. As touching the first couple, the *incarnation of the Son of
God, and the fall of man*: I should answer at the first dash, that
there is no order between them at all: My reason is this, All or-
der in intention hath course onely between the meanes and the
end: But between these two there is no such reference as be-
tween the means and the end. The proposition is Without question;

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

the assumption I prove thus : It belongs to the same Author to be the Author, as of the end, so of the means tending to the end. (All experience justifies this.) But God (though he be the Author of the incarnation of his Sonne, yet) could not be the Author of the fall of man, as he cannot be the Author of sinne. But it is not fit so weighty a question should be strangled *unius verbi prejudicio*, with the prejudice of one word ; therefore let the question proceed (with a little alteration) in comparison of the incarnation of the Sonne of God, and the permission of the fall of *Adam*, which undoubtedly was Gods work as well as the former. Some thinke the decree of the incarnation of the Sonne of God presupposeth the fall of man ; or rather (to speake more accurately in a scholasticall discourse) the consideration of *Adams* fall, and consequently (though this be not alwaies considered) the decree of God to permit *Adams* fall. This order, though very generally received ; yet it is contrary to manifest reason, according to the rule in this Treatise mentioned, and which I take to be most sound. For, if the permission of *Adams* fall were first in intention, then it should be last in execution, and consequently the Son of God should be first incarnate, and after this *Adam* should be permitted to fall. Others it seems (though very few that I have ever bin acquainted with) take another course, and presuppose Gods purpose touching the incarnation of his Sonne to precede his purpose touching the permission of *Adams* fall ; yet not so much for the former reason, as for the honour of Christ. But this will be found upon true scanning, to be as contradictory to manifest reason as the former, and that upon the same ground. For, if God did purpose the incarnation of his Sonne before he purposed the permission of the fall of *Adam*, much more did he purpose the incarnation of his Sonne, before he purposed to permit the sinnes of all men, and particularly the sins of them that crucified the Sonne of God, *Act. 2. 36.* I say *much more* ; onely to signifie that this is much more evident. But this is a thing impossible upon the former ground, and upon the former rule. For, if the incarnation of the Sonne of God were first in intention, then it should be last in execution ; and consequently Christ should first be permitted by God to be crucified, and after this hee should be incarnate. 2. Againe, Did God decree that his Sonne should take humane flesh upon him indefinitely in respect of place where, and time

time when? Or definitely at such a time, and in the wombe of the Virgin *Mary*? Indefinite decrees are generally thought to be nothing becomming God. If definitely, how could this be without the consideration of *Adams* fall? 3. If the decree of incarnation be advanced before the decree of permitting *Adam* to fall, why not before the decree of the creation also, and that not onely of men, but of Angels? Certainly it could not be before the decree of creating Angels: For priority in intention is onely of the end, in reference to the meanes; and certainly the creation of Angels, was no meanes for the incarnation of the Son of God. Now if the decree of incarnation were not before the decree of the creation of Angels, surely it was not before the decree of the creation of mankind: For the decree of the creation of Angels was in no moment before the decree of the creation of man: which I prove thus: If the creation of Angels were first in intention, it should be last in execution, and consequently man should be created before Angels. Now if the incarnation of the Sonne, were not in intention before the creation of mankind in *Adam*, I will here-hence manifestly deduce, that the same incarnation of the Sonne of God was not any moment of nature in intention before the permission of mans fall; for certainly creation of mankind in *Adam* was not: as I prove thus; If *Adams* creation were in Gods intention before the permission of his fall, then should it have bin last in execution; that is, man should be permitted to fall into sinne, before God created him.

Thus, looke by what reason it may appeare, that the permission of *Adams* fall was not in Gods intention before the incarnation of the Sonne of God; by as good reason doth it appeare, that the incarnation of the Sonne of God was not in Gods intention before the permission of *Adams* fall: whence it followeth, that the incarnation of the Son of God, and the permission of *Adams* fall, together with his creation are not *subordinanda*, to be subordinated in Gods intention (as if any of these were the end which God intended, and the rest meanes ordained to that end) but *co-ordinanda*, to be co-ordinated, as joynt means tending to a further end: and that is the manifestation of Gods glory in a way of mercy mixt with justice: Which end doth equally bespeake all the three former as meanes tending thereunto. For, no declaration of Gods glory can be without creation, nor in the way of mercy without permission

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

mission of sinne and misery : nor of such a mercy as is mixt with iustice, without the incarnation and passion of the Son of God.

2. As for the order of the other two, to wit the advancement of the man Christ, and his humiliation, thereof we are now to speake. And first I confesse willingly, that his humiliation could not be intended before his exaltation, lest, being first in intention, it should be last in execution. I will further prove that his advancement or exaltation could not be intended before his humiliation. And first, this may be made evident as touching his greatest advancement, which was by incarnation ; all advancement following was farre inferior unto this. Now this advancement was not intended before his humiliation ; for had it bin first in intention, it had bin last in execution, and consequently Christ had been first humbled, and afterwards his nature taken into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God. Secondly I prove, that the advancement of his humane nature after his passion, was not in Gods intention before his humiliation. For I have already proved that the taking of the humane nature into an hypostaticall union with the Son of God, was not before his humiliation : and you will not say that the advancement of the man Christ you speake of, was in Gods intention before his incarnation, therefore neither was it in Gods intention before his humiliation.

What remains then, but that all these, to wit, the incarnation of the Sonne of God, his humiliation in the flesh, together with his succeeding advancement, are not *sub-ordinanda*, to bee sub-ordinated in Gods intention, (as if onewere the end, and the other meanes tending to that end) but rather *Co-ordinanda*, to be co-ordinated ; if not as joynt meanes tending to one and the same end throughout, yet as different meanes tending to different ends ; or partly the one, partly the other : Still holding up this truth, that no order is to be found in intention between any but such as have the reference of end and meanes amongst themselves. As for example, The incarnation of the Son of God is a sole and single means tending to the manifestation of the greatest free grace of God that ever was or can be shewed to the world ; his humiliation respects both our good and his owne. As it respects ours ; together with his incarnation, it is a meanes to manifest the glory of God in saving us in despite of sinne, and that in the way of justice. In respect of his owne good, together with his advancement
ment

ment, it is a joynt means for manifesting the remunerative justice of God, in rewarding him according to his deserts : in conformity to that of the Apostle, *Therefore hath God exalted him.* But neither this advancement of his, is the end of his humiliation, nor either of these the end of his assumption into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God : Nor his hypostaticall union with the second person in Trinity the end of any of these ; and therefore they are to be accompted rather co-ordinate then subordinate in the intention of God. Phil. 2.

2. Now I come to examine how this doubt is cleared. Here we have first a rule, then the accomodation of this rule. Touching the rule I acknowledge it, and I adde something to the clearing of it. Granting that there is no order in Gods decrees, but such as is grounded upon this, that God purposeth one thing for another. This one thing and another are only the end and the means ; between which we say, in the intention of God there is onely *prioritas rationis*, priority of reason ; which in my judgement is well expounded thus : when *ratio unius petitur à ratione alterius*, the reason of the one is taken from the reason of the other ; as *ratio mediorum petitur à ratione finis*, the reason of the means is taken from the reason of the end. And therefore we say, The end is first in intention, and then the meanes.

As for the accomodation of the rule, it seems to me to be nothing at all to the purpose ; for the doubt proposed was not how it might appear that there was any thought of the glorifying of God, before the presupposall of Adams fall, and of Christs humiliation. We willingly acknowledge the glory of God was thought on before them all, both before the incarnation, advancement of the man Christ, mans fall, and Christs humiliation : I say, before them all, *prioritate rationis*, by priority of reason ; for, undoubtedly, both the incarnation of the Son of God, That is, the hypostaticall union of Christs manhood to the second person in the Trinitie, and the advancement of the man Christ, was to the glory of God as the end thereof, as well as ought else. And this glory of God hath been specified at least in part. And as for the glorifying of himself in Christ, this still denotes the glory of God as the end, though it addes withall the matter wherein it shines, to wit, the man Christ. And to prevent the errour of equivocation, that usually lurkes under generalls. This glorifying of God in

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

Christ consists either in severall, or in common, with the glorifying of himself in man also; to wit, in the elect, considered in severall. I confesse there is a double glory of God, manifested in Christ: The one is the glory of his pure grace in conferring the greatest good and honour that the creature is capable of, as namely in the hypostaticall union of the manhood of Christ to the second person in the Trinitie.

Secondly the glory of Gods remunerative justice in the highest degree possible, both in respect of the reward, the greatest that possibly could be deserved (for that hypostaticall union could not be deserved) and that is the glorification of the humane nature of Christ, both in respect of his glory absolute, and of his glory relative, as by whom salvation is procured to others: as also in respect of the desert, the greatest I thinke that possibly could be, to wit, the humiliation of the Sonne if God to the death of the crosse in way of obedience to his Fathers will. There is also a glory of God that appeares in Christ, not in severall, as a sole meanes thereof, but in common with other meanes joyntly concurring thereunto: and that is the glory of God in the way of mercie mixt with justice, in saving sinners for the obedience of Christ. The glory of God in all these severall wayes was in the first place intended by God before ought else, *prioritate rationis*, in prioritie of reason; and afterwards the congruous meanes to these severall ends, as the ends them selves did bespeake, were intended by him: for *ratio mediorū petitur à ratione finis*; the reason of the meanes is taken from the reason of the end. But all this is nothing to shew that the incarnation of the second person, or advancement of the man Christ, should be before the consideration of mans fall, or Christs humiliation. Yet let us examine that which followeth, delivered by way of proof of that which no man, that I know, makes question of.

Ans. 1.

Because Christ was ordained before the world was, therefore before the consideration either of Creation or Fall. For, in scripture phrase, when God is said to doe one thing before another, he meaneth before the existence or being of it in his consideration, as an inducement leading him unto it, as well as before the existence of it by nature: As when God is said to have loved Jacob rather then Esau before they had done either good or evill. Rom. 9. 11. He meaneth before they had done it in his consideration, as a cause or condition.

condition leading him to love, or hatred, as well as in actual performance in their owne persons.

I pray consider, why was Christ ordained, and to what end, before the world was? Was he not ordained to be incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, and to be a Lambe for a burnt offering, to make satisfaction for sins? And was it possible that this ordination could have course without consideration of the creation and fall? And though this be confessed, yet will it not here hence follow, that the decree of creation and permission of mans fall, was before the decree of the incarnation of the Sonne of God: which alone, as I conceive, casteth some mens inventions upon the platforme of a new course. And consequently it will not follow, that, in this case, the consideration of creation and fall should precede as motives to God to send his Sonne: For first, I say, the considerations hereof are not all precedent, but conjunct and concomitant, like as are the decrees. Secondly, if they did precede, yet should they not precede as motives. Good or evill workes are fit motives, I confesse, of election and reprobation, if it were possible their considerations could precede the one or the other: But creation and fall are no fit motives of ordaining Christ, (for they were found in Angels as well as in men) though the consideration of them could precede this ordination. 2. Election is as expressly said to be before the foundation of the world, as the ordination of Christ. And was not reprobation in opposition to election in the same moment of time and nature also? Doth not election connote reprobation? But it will be said that this phrase, *before the world*, signifies not any measure of duration when that worke was done, but a negation of any consideration had of the creation or fall. This seems a very strange construction; therefore it deserves to be discussed.

3. *Before Abraham was I am*; would you interpret it thus: Before the consideration of Abraham, I am? *Before the Child shall have knowledge to eschew the evill, and to choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings*, is the meaning hereof, before the consideration of the Childs knowledge to eschew the evill and to choose the good?

4. Is not this a manifest course to overthrow our best evidence of the eternitie of election and Christs ordination? For what evidence

dence doth the word of God affoord comparable to these? And we know that out of our selves some have risen, denying the eternitie of Gods decrees: and shall we do them such acceptable service, as in blasting such evidences as these that make against them? Then let us goe and interpret accordingly the Apostle, where he speakes of some thing promised *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*, and say the meaning is, before the consideration of those *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι*, times consisting of many ages, or some thing in them, I know not what.

2 Tim. 1. 9.

5. I grant, *before they had done good or evil*, Rom. 9. is as much as before the consideration of any good or evil done by them. The text it selfe doth bespeake this meaning. But will it follow that, *because before they had done good or evil*, Rom. 9. is as much as *before the consideration of their good or evil workes*; the text bespeaking that sense, therefore, 1 Pet. 1. 20. where Christ is said to be ordained before the world, it is as much as to say, Christ was ordained before the consideration of the creation and fall; the text bespeaking no such interpretation, but rather resisting it, by the comparison made betwixt the ordination of Christ, and the declaration of Christ; the one said to be made before the foundations of the world, the other said to be made in these last times? as much as to say the one before all times, the other not till these last times: Times with times compared, not consideration of the creation and fall with these last times.

6. Again, the consideration of works, good or evil, are fit motives (as hath beene said) unto election and reprobation if they could precede them; but the consideration of the creation and fall, though preceding, yet is no fit motive to the ordination of Christ; wee well know they were found in Angels as well as in men. By the way, where I pray is it said, *that God loved Jacob rather then Esau*? I find it said Rom. 9. *that God loved Jacob and hated Esau*. But if you take liberty to interpret it thus, *He loved Jacob rather then Esau*; why may not I as well take liberty to interpret it thus, *God hated Esau rather then Jacob*? yet I confesse the former interpretation is made by *Cornelius de lapide* the Jesuite.

Ans. 2.

God chose us before the world in Christ our head, Eph. 1. 4. Therefore hee chose Christ also to bee our head before the world was. For if we be chosen in him, it implyeth that he, as our head, was chosen before us in order, and we in him, Now if we who

were

before the presupposall of the fall of Adam.

9

were chosen in Christ, and so after Christ in order; if wee (I say) were chosen before the world, and so before the consideration either of creation or fall, how much more Christ, who was chosen before us?

In the allegation of Saint Pauls text, I find something left out that pertaines to the compleating of the sentence: for the sentence is this, *Who hath chosen us in Christ, that we should be holy*: Here the latter part of one entire sentence is quite left out. And by your dismembring it, the sentence is made causelessly obscure, and so the fitter to serve for advantages. This is *Arminius* course, *Exam.* Pag. 31. *Apostolus ait, nos in Christo electos esse*; The Apostle saith, we are elected in Christ. And as something in the text is left out: so something besides the text is put in, *God chose us before the world in Christ our head*. This likewise *Arminius* insists on, *Exam.* Pag. 158. And marke I pray you how he works upon each; *To be elect in Christ*, is with him, *to be elect being in Christ*: for, *nos in Christo*, with him is, *nos existentes in Christo*. And seeing we are not in Christ but by faith, hereupon he makes the object of election to be *fideles*, the faithfull; or *in Christum credentes*, such as believe in Christ. We answer: first, We may take as great libertie to interpret it, for explication sake, by supplying a participle of the future tense, thus, *elegit nos futuros in Christo*, he chose us hereafter to be in Christ: (like as it followes, *who hath predestinated us to be adopted*. Now we are adopted by faith, *Gal. 3. 26.*) as he takes liberty to supply a participle of the present tense, especially, considering that when we were elect, to wit, before the foundation of the world, we were not at all, and consequently were not *fideles*, believers. Secondly wee answer, that the compleat sentence, considered at full, doth manifest in what sense this phrase [*in Christ*] is taken. *He chose us in Christ, that we should be holy*: This shewes to what wee were chosen, to wit, to obtaine holiness, and how; to wit, in Christ, that is, for Christs sake; Like as *v. 3.* 'tis said, *God hath blessed us with all spirituall blessings in Heavenly things in Christ Jesus*: that is, for Christ his sake. And like as *1. Thes. 5. 9.* 'tis said, *God hath ordained us to obtaine salvation thorough Jesus Christ*: So here in a conformable exposition, when it is said, *God hath chosen us in Christ, that wee should be holy*; a faire meaning may be this, God hath ordained us to obtaine holiness through Jesus Christ; especially considering that

C

grace

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

grace is called salvation 2. *Tim.* 1. 9. as well as glory ; And thus *Arminius* himselfe falls upon *Exam.* Pag. 31. *Apostolus inquit, nos in Christo electos esse tanquam in mediatore, cujus sanguine nobis salus parta est.* And thus the danger is fairely avoided of making Christ the cause of our election *quoad actum eligentis*, which not one of our Divines, that I know, maintains, save *Kolloc.* But *Arminius*, I confesse, labours for it tooth and naile, to no other end, but that so he may somewhat plausibly bring in faith also, if not as a cause, yet as a pre-requisite at least of our election. And yet for all the noyse he makes in this kind, calling Christ the foundation of our election, neverthelesse the issue is to confesse that all comes to this, that Christ is therefore the foundation of our election because he is the meritorious cause *bonorum electione preparatorum*, of good things which are prepared by election ; such as he specifies to bee grace and glory, as appeares both in his publique and private disputationes. Now, if in this sense we are said to be elect in Christ, that we should be holy, then it is cleare, we are not elect in Christ *tanquam in capite*; for, *ratio capitis non est ratio causa meritoria*, as *Arminius* himselfe acknowledgeth, *Exam.* Pag. 3. *Apostolus inquit nos electos esse in Christo tanquam in mediatore, cujus sanguine nobis salus parta est & vita*: there a way hath *causa meritoria*, his course. And then he addes, *& ut in capite, ex quo ista bona ad nos derivantur.* So that *ratio capitis* with him is *ratio causa efficientis*; not *morakiter*, but *physicè*: and therein he saith truth. Secondly, observe what he marks out of this, that we are all elect in Christ, *tanquam in capite*, for here-hence he will deduce, that we are elect in Christ *tanquam mortuo & resuscitato*, because Christ was not made the head of his Church till after his resurrection, building as it seemes upon that we read *Ephef.* 1. 20. *Which hee wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his right-hand in heavenly places.* 21. *Farre above all principalities and powers, and every name that is named, not in this world only, but also in that that is to come*: 22. *And hath made all things subject under his feet, and hath given him over all things to be the head of the Church.* But these discourses, if I be not deceived, have taken their originall from a saying of *Austin*, namely that *Christus est predestinatorum caput*, Christ is the head of the predestinate. Therefore I have taken pains to consider the doctrine of *Arminius* hereabouts, consisting of three members. First, Christ

before the presupposall of Mans fall,

11

is the head of the elect or predestinate. Secondly, our election made in Christ, is made in him as in our head. Thirdly, Christ is not our head but as he is dead, and raised; which, because it is much pertinent to the present purpose, I will not spare to set downe, though in another dialect: *Ratio illa altera de Christo considerato ut capite his membris, niti videtur &c.* See my *vindicie gratia Dei*, lib: 2. *crim.* 24. digress. 10. Pag. 74. col. 2. lin. 50. which was not set forth when I wrote this, but since it is.

2. But be it granted that we are chosen in Christ as our head; it followes not here-hence, that Christ Jesus was chosen in order before us. He was ordained to be a Lambe for a burnt offering to save us, and we were ordained to obtain salvation through him. What colour is here, why the former ordination should be conceived to go before the latter, and not rather the contrary; seeing our salvation is plainly intimated to be rather the end of his mission, incarnation and passion, then his mission, incarnation and passion to bee the end of our salvation? So *Joh. 3. 16.* *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Sonne*; where the love of God to us men is designed as a motive with God for the giving of his Sonne; yet I doe not maintaine any such order, I have other reasons to overthrow that, and to bring both these ordinations to be co-ordinate, and not subordinate in the intentions of God. And indeed, as I have said, if the incarnation of the Sonne of God were in Gods intention, before the permission of the sinnes of the world, it would follow, that the permission of the sinnes of the world, even in crucifying Christ, should be first in execution, that is, Christ should be crucified before he was incarnate.

Christ is said in all things to have a preheminance, and God is said to dispose and carry his Counsels and waies towards the Church, that it might appeare, Christ in all things to have the preheminance. God dealeth with us according to the Image of his dealing with him. And therefore in the Counsell of God, Christ had the preheminance to be first purposed, and the elect in him, and both them, and the other creatures for him, that so he might bee the first borne among many brethren. Its accounted somewhat a monstrous and unnaturall conception, the feet to be conceived in the wombe before the head: so were it alike unmeet and preposterous course, the members of Christ to be first thought upon, and conceived in the wombe of the Counsell of Gods predestination, before the head Christ. If God

Answ. 3.

*Col. 1. 18.
Rom. 8. 29.*

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

Col. 1. 16.

should have had no thought of the advancement of Christ man to the fellowship of the second person to become man, till upon the presupposall of the fall of Adam; then were we not created for Christ, but Christ for us, contrary to that of the Apostle; And so Christ shall be brought into the world, as it were, *ens per accidens*, a thing by accident, upon occasion of the fall.

Exam.

When once we have conceived an opinion, we are very prone to take hold of every thing that carrieth any shew of favouring it, howsoever it proves in the issue. Be it that he hath a preheminance in all things and a priority; but will you extend this to such things as are not capable of priority? Is it not confest that God doth not purpose one thing before another in time? Is not the predestination of Christ, and of the elect all one act in God? onely as God ordereth one thing for another, so God purposeth one thing for another. Now which hath the preheminance in Gods predestination, whether that which is purposed for another, or that for which another thing is purposed? I presume you will say, that for which another thing is purposed. why, then consider, whether the salvation of the elect be purposed for the incarnation & passion of the Son of God, or the incarnation & passion of the Son of God purposed for the salvation of Gods elect.

2. The preheminance the Apostle speaks of is the preheminance of Christs person, not of the priority of predestination. Now the preheminance of a person alwaies presupposeth the being of a person; for, to say a thing had a preheminance before it had any being, is a strange phrase, and contradictions. Therefore preheminance of any person is not to be looked for in predestination, which is rather in ordaining to preheminance, then containing preheminance: for we commonly say, that *Prædestinatio nihil ponit in prædestinato*, Predestination puts nothing in the person predestinated.

3. But come we nearer to the Apostle, Col. 1. 18. that he might have the preheminance *ἐν ᾧ οἱ*: this *ἐν ᾧ οἱ* is indefinite, and may be applied two waies, as Calvin observs; *vel in omnes creaturas, vel in omni re*, either over all creatures, or in every thing. You take it as *in omni re*, in every thing, and indeed so the English translation renders it; but if we find in scripture it self this indefinite *ἐν ᾧ οἱ*, or that which is equivalent thereunto defined, and that in speaking of the preheminance of Christ, why should we not comply with scripture in the accommodation of it in this place? Now in the other place alledged, Rom. 8. 29. its defined. not to things but to persons, that

that Christ might be the first begotten in *πρωτοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*, that is, among many brethren; why may we not then in like sort render it here, that he might have the preheminance among all the children of God? So Luke 1. 28. *Blessed art thou among women: So ἐν γυναικί, Inter omnes: So Piscator, Ex. cuius sententia collatione patescit, illud ἐν γυναικί recte hic redditum esse, inter omnes. Phrasis græca est, ne quis putet vertendum esse, in omnibus, scilicet rebus; and Beza, Miminerimus de Christi in ecclesia regno cœpisse ab hoc versiculo disserere, quod nemo negabit qui verba ipsa vel levissimè considerarit, ac proinde universali particula non aliud comprehendit quam omnes omnium temporum fideles. And so Anselme also, Christus primus est resurgentium, ut in omnibus sanctis, tam prioribus quam sequentibus, teneat primatum dignitatis, potentie, sanctitatis. And Lyra, ut sic in omnibus primatum tenens, non solum respectu hominum, sed etiam omnium Angelorum.*

4. But let it run in the neuter gender, of all things, as Beza confesseth it may be so taken, *potest quidem hoc accipi neutro genere, quum in proximo versiculo scribat; yet what meaning doth he make of it but this, vera est (saith he) hæc universalis sententia, Christum inter omnia sine ulla exceptione eminere?* making it signifie still preheminance above or amongst all things, but not in all things.

5. Taking it as in all things, Ambrose interprets it thus, *ut semper in omni vita sit primus & Princeps: in gratia & gloria (saith Aquinas:) In genesi & resurrectione, (saith Cajetan:) Tam in visibilibus quam in invisibilibus creaturis, (saith Hierome.)* Some practicall Divines extend it farre, interpreting it according to our English translation; as, *first in time, first in order, first in the dignitie of the person, first in degree, first in government, first in acceptation with God, first effectively as the cause of all the respect, order, and excellency in others,* none extending it to predestination.

6. Nay, consider whether the text it selfe be not against it, *He is the head of the body of the Church, the beginning, the first begotten of the dead; that in all things he might have the preheminance.* Now consider, was Christ made the head of the body of the Church; was he the first begotten of the dead, to this end, that he might have the preheminance in predestination?

When it is said, that the other creatures were for him, that *so he might be the first borne among many brethren; I find want of*

Whether there was any thought of Christs incarnation

convenient proportion : for what did the being of other creatures for him further his primacie or eldership amongst many brethren?

It is true, all things were for him : but take the rest along with this ; *all things are created by him and for him* : which clearly hath reference to his Godhead, one with the Father and holy Ghost, as *Rom. 11. From him, and by him, and for him are all things*; and *Heb. 2. 10.*

It is, I confesse, Maister Baynes his conceit, that it is as unmeet and preposterous for the members of Christ to be first thought upon in the wombe of Gods counsell in predestination, as it is accompted monstrous and unnaturall for the feete to be conceived in the wombe before the head. And is it not as unnaturall to have the feete brought forth before the head ? Yet we know many thousands of Christs members were brought forth, both into the world of nature, and into the world of grace, before the man Christ. Yet am not I of their mindes that thinke that any was elect before the predestination of Christ. I say with *Aquinas, si consideretur predestinatio Christi & nostra, quantum ad actum predestinantis, sic una non est causa alterius, quia idem non est causa sui ipsius; sed eodem actu divino predestinatus est Christus & nos : ergo predestinatio Christi non est causa nostra predestinationis. Si vero consideretur quoad effectum & terminum, cum effectus nostre predestinationis sit gratia, & gloria, & adoptio filiorum ; sic dicendum, quod utraq; predestinatio Christi causa est predestinationis nostre & efficiens & exemplaris.* And I hope 'tis nothing unmeet that God should at once thinke of Christ and his elect ; as at once he thought of Angels & wormes ; especially considering that Christ and his elect are correlatives ; as he the head and they his mysticall body. Nay at once God did from everlasting both know himselfe, and know all things in himselfe. Yet I am perswaded the chiefeest motive to devise a prioritie of Christs predestination before others, was only this conceite, that if it be not *prior*, it must needs be *posterior*. But I have endeavoured in brieve to shew here (as elsewhere more at large) that the predestination of Christ is neither *prior* nor *posterior* to the predestination of the elect. And indeed most are so pulled about devising a right place for the predestination of Christ amongst the decrees of God, that usually that is left quite out, because they know not where to finde a fit place for it : and all because they presume he must be predestinate either
before

before the decree of creation and permission of sinne, or after; neither of which can hold water, but they are both equally removed from the truth.

Where we are said to be created for Christ, it is joyntly said, we were created by Christ, which undoubtedly proceeds of Christ as God. And if *Adam* had not fallen, but the world of mankind stood in integrity, what glory had redounded to the man Christ more by our creation, then by the creation of Angels?

Though God had decreed the advancement of the man Christ upon presupposall of *Adams* fall (which yet I hold to be impossible) yet this had not hinderd but we had been created for Christ, and that divers wayes: 1. To reape benefit by him after our fall. 2. To be of the number of those over whom the man Christ should one day rule, if not in grace (for thousands were out of that state before Christ man had any being) yet in glory. 3. As also to glorifie him both in this world (though this is verified of those only who were brought forth after his incarnation, for Christ man had no being before, and consequently could not be glorified before) and in the world to come. Yet it cannot be denyed, but that Christ also was both incarnate, and lived, and died for us and for our salvation, though that of the Apostle which you mention is nothing to this purpose, as spoken of Christ God, and not of Christ man.

Undoubtedly, Christ came into the world upon the occasion of mans fall, for he came into the world as a Physitian, and to call sinners unto repentance; which had beene merely in vaine, had not sinne entred into the world by *Adam*.

It doth not follow, that if we were not created for Christ, but Christ for us, then Christ should be brought into the world as *Ens per accidens*; for the heavens and the earth, together with the lights of the one, and herbes and trees of the other, and bruit beasts, were created for man and not man for them; yet neither of them all were brought forth as *Ens per accidens*: yet, had they beene brought forth *per accidens*, never-a-whit the more had they been *Entia per accidens*; *Entia per se* may be brought forth *per accidens*: to be *Ens per accidens* is one thing, and to be brought forth *per accidens* is another thing.

It had been more tolerable to argue thus; If Christ had been brought forth into the world only upon occasion of *Adams* fall, then he had beene brought forth *per accidens*; yet no truth had beene

beene found in it; for upon occasions wise-men doe work, and proceed deliberately and with counsell, not temerariouly; only man, not foreseeing the events of things, doth many times (upon emergent occasions which himselfe could not foresee) alter his former counsels, and cast himselfe upon new deliberations. It is otherwise with God, as who infallibly foreseeeth all things, and not only fore-seeth them, but ordaineth they shall come to passe as well as he ordaineth causes and effects. For, not the things themselves are ordained by God, but also the very order of them; some to bee effects, some causes, some occasions. And so the very fall of *Adam* was both fore-seen and fore-ordained by God to come to passe; but how? Not as good things which he ordaineth to come to passe, *ipso faciente*, himselfe working them; but as all evill things which are ordained also to come to passe, but *Deo tantummodo permittente qua mala sunt*, God only permitting them as they are evill; according to that of *Anstin*, *Non aliquid fit nisi Omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinando ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo*. *Enchirid.* 95. And according to the 11. article of Ireland, God did from all eternitie ordain whatsoever in time should come to passe.

Ans. 4.

That which is first in the intention of every agent, is last in execution. Now the glory of Christ is last in execution (save onely the glory of the Father;) And therefore surely it was Gods first and chiefeſt intendment, after the glorifying of himselfe, to glorifie Christ, before the consideration of glorifying us, either in the first or second Adam, *Psal.* 2. 9, 10, 11. It is true, in fulnes of time Christ was first humbled, that he might be glorified; but yet in Gods counsell (wherein the end in order is first purposed, before the meanes leading to that end) the glorious advancement of Christ was first purposed, before the presupposall of his humiliation, which made way for it. The Apostle describing the subordination of things one to another, in the order wherein God hath set them; the world to be for the Church, and the Church for Christ, and Christ for God; he thereby gives us to understand, God first intended his glory, for which are all things, and then Christs, for whom the Church is, and then the Church, for which the world is, and then the world last of all.

Exam. 1.

Here we have an argument, and a place of scripture wherewith it is backt: I will consider them severally.

1. As for the argument; that is grounded upon such a rule as

I desire no better direction for the right ordering of Gods decrees, which is the matter wee have in hand ; but in the prosecuting of the argument in hand, upon this rule, I find no soundnes, no truth, neither in the matter nor in the method. For first, though the rule be proposed only of two, the first and last; yet in the exemplification there is mention made of three, as if the rule did not only extend to first and last; but also to former and latter, how many wayes soever they are in subordination; that looke what subordination they have in execution, the contrary subordination they should have in intention; which will be found contrary to all reason: As for example, the last of the good of man is his glory, but how? Both of body and soule in the resurrection. But before this there was a glory of the soule in departure from the body, or a blessed condition of it, accordingly as they are called *the spirits of just men perfected*, Heb. 12. and they enjoy Christs presence, 2 Cor. 5. Now shall we say, that in Gods intention was the glory of body and soule, jointly first, and secondly the glory of the soule in departure from the body? Come we to the state of grace, there we have in execution, first effectually calling unto faith, and repentance, after this perseverance small in both; shall we therefore say, God did first intend to give them perseverance in faith and repentance, and then intend to give them faith and repentance? Or that God did first intend to give them repentance, secondly intend to permit them to sinne? After this manner, I confesse, *Piscator* had sometimes ordered Gods decrees, wherein upon due examination I have scarce found one member sound: But see the issue of it; upon latter thoughts he fell quite off from this order, and embraced the contrary in every particular, and so recompenced his extream rashnesse with extream loosnesse. And no marveile, for truth alone is stable; as for error, it is a slippery thing, there is no stabilitie in it. Secondly here is nothing but miserable confusion throughout: First in the word *glory*; for the glory of the Father is delivered in one sense, our glory in another sense. And as for the glory of Christ, in what sense that is delivered, is utterly uncertaine; as whether in conformitie to the glory of the Father, or in conformitie to our glory, or in conformitie to both, which will be so much the more equivocal: by that which goes before, it may seeme to be spoken in conformitie to the glory of God the Father; as when it is often inculcated, that all things were made for him: by that which

Whether God intended the glorifying of Christ

meth after, it may seeme to be spoken in conformitie to our glory; as when it is said, the glorious advancement of Christ was first purposed. Again, the glory of God the Father is in very great varietie; and therefore it behooved to be specified in what kind the glory of God herein specified is to be understood: as I will shew in the first place, when I come to oppose it particularly.

Secondly the glory of Christ is very ambiguous, both in respect of his person, as whether it be spoken of him in respect of his Godhead, or of his manhood; and it is nothing fitt these should be confounded: as also in respect of the word *glory* it selfe; for it is to be doubted (as before I said) whether it be spoken in conformitie to the glory of the Father, or in conformitie to our glory. And out of such a masse of confusion what satisfaction can be expected in any distinct and particular truth? 3. I see no reason why the glory of Christ only should be considered as the meanes of advancing the glory of God the Father. I conceive the glory of God is as much seen in the abasing of his Sonne, as in his exaltation; and if this very abasing of himselfe be called his glory, as indeed it may; for even on the crosse *he spoiled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly, and triumphed over them,* Col. 2. then this discourse shall labour with a new equivocation. In like sort, Is nothing but our glory a fit meanes to advance the glory of Christ, and of God? Is not God glorified as well in the martyrdome of his Saints? *This is my confidence* (saith Paul) *that God shall be glorified in my body, whether by life or by death,* Philip. 1. yea and Christ also; *Even when we beare about us the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life of Jesus might also be made manifest in our bodies.* 2 Cor. 4. 10 If our glory also be extended unto martyrdome, this is a very fore equivocation, especially considering how the scripture doth distinguish them: *first to suffer, then to enter into glory,* Luk. 24. 26. *and if we suffer with him, we shall also reigne with him,* 2 Tim. 2. 12. 4. But as it lyeth, let us discusse it as well as we can. Therefore I say, first, Gods glory is not onely last in execution, but first also; even from the very first creation, even then *when the stars of the morning praised him, and all the Sonnes of God rejoiced,* Job 38. 7. And I will deale plainly, and shew what glory of his was manifested herein, to wit, the glory of his power, Revel. 4. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things*

things, and for thy wills sake they have beene and are created. Yea and his wisdom also, *Psal. 130. 5. which by his wisdom made the heavens.* Jeremiah puts them both together, *He hath made the earth by his power, and established the World by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.* And as in the creation, so the same glory of God doth send forth 'its beames in the preservation and governance of all things. In the meanest creatures we behold the glory of God; neither are we able to comprehend the wisdom of God therein; every thing therein, as in a Bee or silke-worme, coming to passe by courtesie of nature; yet who is able to give a reason of it? I thinke, if *Solomon* had continued to this day, and his wisdom with him, yet had he not beene able to finde it out; for although *the spirit of man be as the lampe of God,* Vers. 10, 17. *which searcheth all inwardnesse, and God hath set the world in mans heart, yet is he not able to finde out the worke that he hath* Eccles. 3. 11. *wrought from the beginning to the end.* I behold the flowers of my garden, in great varietie of colours; yet wonder at their uniformitie; each single one hath five leaves, each most uniforme in the colour, in the shape, rising, and spreading, and indented alike in their edges; all together make a most comely proportion of the whole round in forme, only indented in the edges, which is as bonelace to set it forth, some of one colour throughout the pageant, speckled, having strakes like lines, so direct and proportionable in all, that it represents unto me some curious Mathematicall circle cut thorough with lines, the matter of many curious demonstrations. And what a curious speculation would it appeare to represent the causes of all this varietie? In the meane time, our contemplation is broken off, and loseth it selfe, and turnes into admiration at the wisdom of God, which confounds us in the contemplation of a flower, which is worn in the breast at morning, and troden under foot at night. But to returne, you will say, Another kind of glory is seene in the advancement of Christ; but then you should have specified it: which had you done, I doubt not but it would have afforded good matter to have wrought upon in the investigation of truth. 2. As the glorifying of God the Father was the very first, even from the creation, before either Christ man was, or we; so I say, it is not so last, as if it should be after Christs glory, and our glory shall cease to be; for certainly, the glory of Christ, and the glory of the elect shall continue for ever;

Whether God intended the glorifying of Christ

and the glory of God cannot continue any longer then for ever.

3. Come wee to the consideration of the glory of Christ : There is a glory of Christ which he receiveth from man, and there is a glory of Christ which hee receiveth from God : That glory which hee receiveth from man, he hath received in greatest part long before wee were born; for it is the Fathers pleasure, *That all men should honour the Sonne, as they honour the Father*, Joh. 5. 23. There is the Rule : here followeth the Example ; *Worthy is the Lambe that was killed to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and praise. And all the creatures which are in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Praise, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for evermore*, Revel. 5. 12, 13.

As for the glory which he receives from his Father, that he hath already received above 1500. yeers agoe. *I have overcome, and am sate with my Father in his Throne*, Revel. 3. *If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorifie him in himselfe, and shall straight-way glorifie him*, Ioh. 13. 32. So that every way the glory of Christ, is afore ours, not after ours ; for when the elect are once glorified, their glory shall continue for the time to come as long as Christs glory : but for the time past, certainly, Christs glory and his advancement, you here speak of, (noting thereby what you meane by Christs glory in this place) was long before ours. Whereas you say, that *Christ, as man, was first humbled, before hee was glorified*; if we consider the greatest advancement of Christ, it is untrue ; for his greatest advancement was the assuming of his nature into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God, and this was afore his humiliation in the sense you speake of, to wit, in *humbling himselfe to the death, even to the death of the Crosse* : though I willingly confesse, the humiliation of the Godhead went joyntly along with the advancement of the manhood, even to this hypostaticall union. You say, *His advancement was purposed before his humiliation*. I deny it : You will say, that was the meanes tending to his advancement, as the end (for so I take your meaning to be, leaving the consideration of the phrase mentioned of *making way*; which if it be delivered in any other sense then to signifie the meanes of his advancement, will make your cause worse, and nothing better.)

For

For now I deny that Christs humiliation was the meanes of Christs advancement ; and I prove it : Those only are to bee accounted meanes to such an end , *quorum ratio petitur a ratione finis designati*, that is, the means are onely such as the nature of the end, duly considered, doth bespeake : But the advancement of Christ doth not bespeake any such meanes ; for, undoubtedly, God could advance Christ without any such humiliation : nay, having taken his manhood into an hypostaticall union with his Son, even in this respect his advancement was far more requisite, than in respect of his humiliation. You will say, God purposed to advance him no other way then this. I grant it : and if you consider it well, you shall find the reason of it, by considering the right ends hereof in the counsell of God : And these are different ; one was in respect of others, to wit, that he might be a fit Saviour of Gods elect : not that their salvation was the end of his humiliation ; but the glory of God, in a certain kind, the end of both, to wit, both of his humiliation and our salvation ; namely, the glory of his free grace, in the way of mercy mixt with justice. This end required satisfaction, as without which it could not be procured. But here, I confesse, the advancement of Christ hath no place : but in another consideration it shall find place, and that as a joynt meanes together with his humiliation ; for another kind of glory would God the Father manifest in Christ : (And, indeed, the Nation of mankind is as a glasse, wherein a very complete body of Gods glory doth appear, in very great variety :) and that was, the manifestation of his glory in the way of remunerative justice, in the highest degree remunerating obedience : I say, in the highest degree, both in respect of the reward deserved, and also in respect of the desert it selfe : the reward being the sitting in the Throne of his Father, and to have all judgment committed unto the Sonne ; the desert being the obedience of the Son of God, one and the same God with his Father, humbling himselfe to death, even to the death of the crosse, for the salvation of Gods elect. But perhaps you may further say, It is not necessary that the means should bee only such as the end doth naturally require ; For, God could have brought man to salvation the same way he brought Angels, without faith and repentance ; yea, hee could have made them, and immediatly have translated them into glory : yet wee commonly say, Faith and Repentance are the means of salvation. I answer, granting not onely that wee com-

Whether God intended the glorifying of Christ

monly say so, but that wee truly say so, in respect of our selves; namely, that as salvation is the scope and end wee aime at, so faith and repentance are the onely meanes to bring us thereunto; but in respect of God it is utterly untrue; for neither is our salvation the end of Gods actions, but his owne glory: *Hee made all things for himselfe*, Prov.16.4. And if it were his end, hee could have brought it about divers other wayes besides this: but in that hee brings it to passe this way, there is good reason for it, as wee shall well perceive, if wee take the end of God aright, namely, to manifest his glory in doing good to man in the highest degree, and that in the way of mercy mixt with justice. This end doth necessarily require a permission of sin; again, it doth require satisfaction, as by the death of Christ; and thirdly, it doth require faith and repentance, that so hee may doe him good, by way of reward; and lastly, a glorious salvation, which is the doing of him good in the highest degree. And as mans salvation is not the end of Gods actions, so neither is the glory of Christ, as hee is man, the end of Gods actions; for such a glory inherent can but bee a created glory, and no created thing can be the end of Gods actions; but onely God himselfe: For, as he is the chiefe efficient of all, so must hee bee the supreme end of all: and as hee is most lovely, and most good; so must hee necessarily love that most which is most lovely, even himselfe, and aime at his owne glory in all.

2 Now I come to the Apostles Text, wherewith this Argument is backt, 1 Cor.3. 22,23. *All are yours, and yee Christs, and Christ Gods*: that is, say you, *The world for the Church, and the Church for Christ, and Christ for God*: thereby giving us to understand, That God first intended his glory, for which are all things; and then Christ, for whom the Church is; and then the Church, for which the world is; and then the world last of all. But, I pray you, consider whether this Interpretation, and Collection thereupon, be not more superficiali than sound: First, when he saith, *All are yours*, is the world onely to be understood by all? Is not the world expressely named but as a member of this universall? Are not *Paul, Apollos, and Cephas* also joyned with it; together with life, and death, and things present, and things to come, and joyntly comprehended under the word *all*? Verse 21. *Let no man rejoyce in men, for all things are yours*, Verse 22. *Whether it be Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, whe-*
tho.

ther they be things present, or things to come, even all are yours, 23. And yee Christs, and Christ Gods. As he was perswaded, Rom.8.38. *That neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, 39. Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, should bee able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Iesus our Lord;* and therefore wee need not feare them: So here he goes further, and tells us, that all are put, as it were, in subjection unto us, to worke for our good; and therefore wee should not rejoyce in them, but rather in Christ, and in God, who hath wrought this, and ordered all this for our good, through the merits of Christ: not only Apostles and Pastours, but even the very Angels also, who pitch their tent about us, and have charge given them, to keep us in all our wayes; and all of them are sent forth for the good of them that are heires of salvation: Yet this subjection is onely of a spirituall and gracious nature, nothing prejudicing their advancement above them whom they thus serve in love; and that for this their service performed for Gods sake, to whom rather they are in subjection then unto us; yet so farre in subjection to worke our good, that it becommes us not to rejoyce in any of them, but rather in God, who hath thus ordered them for our good, and Christ for whose sake they are thus ordered: An Argument, like to that the Lord useth, Deut.4.19. *Take heed lest thou lift up thine eyes to heaven, and when thou seest the sunne, and the moon, and the starres, with all the host of heaven, shouldst bee driven to worship them, and serve them.* Now marke the reason whereupon the Lord dehorts them from this, *which the Lord thy God hath distributed to all people under the whole heaven:* as much as to say, God hath made them to doe you service, therefore doe not you make them your gods: So Pastours, and Apostles, and Angels, are made by God to doe us service, therefore let not us make them our gods. Thus wee see plainly by *All*, in this place, not the world only, but the Church of God is signified; every one of them being made to doe service unto the Church, that is, one unto another; For, are they not all members of one body, though some performe more honourable service then others? like as in a naturall body, some members are more honourable, and for more honourable uses than others. Unless we thus understand it, wee shall exclude the Apostles out of the Church. And when it is said, *We are Christs*, this seemeth not

Whether God intended the glorifying of Christ

not to admit the same sense with the former ; for, undoubtedly, Christ is as much for our good as any, nay more then all the world, the Apostles, and Angels, and all ; *for unto us hee was born, unto us hee was given*, Ela. 9. 6. given by the Father, *Joh. 3. 16.* given by himselfe, and that for us, *Tit. 2. 14. Gal. 2. 20.* and that to dye for our sinnes, and rise againe for our justification, *Rom. 4.* and, to redeeme us from all iniquity, and to purge us a peculiar people unto himselfe, zealous of good works, *Tit. 2. 14.* and that by his blood, *1 Joh. 1. 7. Revel. 1. 5.* Wee are therefore his, not so much in respect of any good wee bring to him, but in respect that hee hath bought us ; And so we are Gods too, as, *Who sent his Son to redeem us unto God his Father, Revel. 5. 9. Yee are bought with a price, therefore glorifie God in your bodies, and in your spirits, for yee are Gods, 1 Cor. 6. 20.* And Christ is Gods in speciall manner ; as touching his Godhead, the naturall Sonne of God ; as touching his Manhood assumed into an hypostaticall union with his naturall Sonne : in both, the Chiefe Servant of God, for the work of mediation and redemption, for Gods elect, given by the Father unto him, that he might bestow eternall life upon them, *Joh. 17. 2.* according to the good pleasure of his Father, *Mar. 10. 40.* Thus I have been bold to deliver my judgement touching the Interpretation of this place, without consulting any Interpreter ; onely the native genius of the Text it selfe seemed to afford sufficient light, and evidence, to discerne the meaning thereof ; which I willingly submit to the judgement of any.

Ans^r.

It is no part of my meaning to dispute, much lesse to determine, whether Christ should have been incarnate, if Adam had never fallen : I conceive it a question no lesse frivolous, then curious. The purpose of glorifying Christ, though it presuppose not the creation or fall of man, as making way for such an intention in God, yet doth it enforce the creation and fall of Adam, as making way for this purpose.

Exam.

Nothing, usually, doth cause more perturbation and hinderance in the inquisition of truth, than incommodious expressions : *The purpose of glorifying Christ* (say you) *presupposeth not the creation and fall.* No marvell, for the creation and fall are things temporall ; but Gods purposes are eternall. Again, such a purpose (you say) *doth not make way to any such intention :* This phrase, *such intention,* is spoken in reference to the creation and fall ; as if they

Were

were intentions, which indeed they are not ; but rather executions of intentions : it should run thus, *As making way for the intentions of such things in God.* Purpose and Intention signifying the same, it is good to keep our selves in one sentence to the use of one of them, lest wee expose our Readers to distraction, possibly suspecting they may have different significations. Your meaning, questionlesse, is this, *Gods intention of glorifying Christ doth not presuppose the intention of creation or fall of Adam :* And I am of your mind in this. But your meaning containes two things more, whereof the first is this, *Gods intention of the creation and fall, doth presuppose his intention of glorifying Christ :* The second is this, *Gods intention of glorifying Christ, doth inferre the intention of creation and fall of Adam.* As in both these I differ from you, so I will endeavour to disprove your opinion in both. And first, I prove that the intention of glorifying Christ, was not before the intention of creation, and permission of *Adams* fall. For although this may seeme plausible, for as much as thus the glorifying of Christ, as it is first in intention, so also shall it be most congruously last in execution ; yet according to this very rule, the issue will fall more foule then you are aware of ; For, to begin with the Creation ; if the glorifying of Christ were before creation, then also was it much more before the generation of all mankind : but this will appeare to be most untrue, by the same rule ; for, if in comparison of the glorifying of Christ, with the generation of all mankind, the glorifying of Christ was first in intention, then accordingly it should bee last in execution, which is most untrue ; for that of the Apostle, *Heb. 9. 2. Wee see Jesus crowned with glory and honour,* was delivered above 1500. years agoe, and yet the generation of all mankind is not in execution. Again, if the glorifying of Christ were first in intention, then was it the end, and the generation of all mankind should be as the meanes tending to the furthering of that end ; but what, I pray, doth the generation of a little child of mine tend to the furtherance of the glory of Christ, wherewith hee was crowned above 1500. years agoe ? Come we to the permission of *Adams* fall : I say, the glorifying of Christ was not in intention before this, though it seems never so plausible in respect of congruity in execution ; for, by reason of incongruity, in the very same kind, I disprove it thus ; If the glorifying of Christ were in Gods intention before the permission of *Adams* fall, then

Whether Gods intention of glorifying Christ

much more was it before the permission of other mens finnes in Gods intention; but this is most untrue, upon the very same ground: For, if in comparison between the glorifying of Christ, and the permission of all mens finnes to the end of the world, the glorifying of Christ were first in Gods intention, then should it be last in execution; which is most untrue: for the glorifying of Christ was accomplished above 1500. years agoe, as hath been shewed; but the permission of all mens finnes, to the end of the world, is not yet in execution. Again, if the glorifying of Christ were first in intention, then should it have *rationem finis*, and the permission of all mens finnes, to the end of the world, should be a congruous meanes to that end; but to averre this were most unreasonable; for what furtherance doth my finnes this day and houre afford to the glorifying of the Sonne of God, which was accomplished 1500. years agoe? If it be replied, that this glorifying of Christ is spoken in reference to a glory of Christ which is yet to come, to wit, the kingdome of Christ which wee look for, 2 Tim. 4.1. I answer, there is no reason why it should have any particular reference unto that; for as much as that glory shall have an end: For that kingdome shall continue but for a while; *Hee must raigne till hee hath put all his enemies under his feet*, 1 Cor. 15.25. And, *When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Sonne himselfe bee subject to him that did subdue all things under him, that God may be all in all*, Verse 28. Again, if the glorifying of Christ were in Gods intention before the permission of Adams fall, then were it before the permission of reprobates to fall in Adam, as well as of Gods elect, and consequently before the permission of all finnes of the reprobates, unto the end of the world, and before their generations; and all these should be first in execution, as meanes tending to the furthering and promotion of the glory of Christ. Secondly, I deny that the intention of glorifying Christ doth inferre either the creation of Adam or his fall; yet, by the way, I am glad to see you acknowledge, that the intention of the end doth inferre the intention of congruous meanes: But seeing, by that I have already shewed, it must inferre as well the generation of all mankind, to the end of the world; therefore, I pray, what colour of reason can bee devised, why it should inferre the generation of such a number of men as shall be, precisely, rather then more or lesse? So in respect of permission of Adams fall, I have already proved,

proved, that the glorifying of Christ must be before the permission of mens sins, to the end of the world, as well as of Adams fall, and consequently inferre that as well as the other : And what colour of reason can be given, why it should precisely inferre the permission of just so many mens sinnes, and just so many sinnes of such men as shall bee to the end of the world, neither more nor lesse? Again, if the intention of glorifying Christ doth inferre Adams fall, then seeing by denying the Consequents the Antecedent must bee as justly denied, it followeth manifestly, that if Adams had not sinned, Christ had not been glorified, and consequently, had not been advanced to an hypostaticall union with the second person in Trinity : And yet to make question thereof, you professe to bee no lesse frivolous than curious. I confesse, it is rather frivolous than curious to draw that into question, the negative whereof doth evidently follow upon that which is positively received. Again, others, of the same opinion with you, are driven to take notice of this Question, for to derive this opinion of yours from a more ancient originall than Mr. Baynes upon the Apostle to the Ephesians, *Petrus Alphonsus Mendoza*, a Spaniard, maintains the same ; A Doctor of the Chaire in the University of Salamanca, not of Moses Chaire, nor of Pauls Chaire, no nor Austins Chaire, nor of Aquinas Chaire, but of Scotus Chaire; whose opinion is to be seen in his first Theologicall Controversie, printed 43. years agoe ; and what his opinion was, appears by these conclusions :

1. *Omnium que Deus ab aeterno in mente sua facere excogitavit, primum fuit, unio hypostatica verbi divini : Secundum, predestinatio omnium electorum : Tertium, natura rerum conditio. Ac proinde priora sunt supernaturalia quam naturalia, & ordo natura presupponit ordinem gratia.*

2. *Nullius futuri praeſcientia praeſupponitur in mente Dei ad praeſtinationem, ſed omnia ex ipſa ſequentur : atque adeo nihil priuſus ab aeterno decrevit Deus facere, vel in tempore facit, nihil permittit, ſive intendit, ſive naturale, ſive ſupernaturale, ſive res ſit magni ponderis, ſive minimi & fere nullius, quod non inde perueniat, ſitque effectus & medium praeſtinationis electorum & Chriſti. Atque adeo omnia cadunt ſub ordine divinae praeſtinationis, tanquam media ad Chriſti & ſanctorum gloriam ordinata.*

Whether the glorifying of Christ enforces the

3. *Non est aliqua alia providentia in Deo antecedens prædestinationem, ex qua, scil. providentia, proveniant res naturales & quidam alij effectus supernaturales; sed unica est duntaxat providentia, ipsaque est prædestinatio, ex qua omnia in universum nullo prorsus excepto, habent sequi. Atque adeò juxta hanc conclusionem totum universum ut complectitur, naturalia & supernaturalia, bona & mala, substantias & accidentia, & omnes in universum modos essendi & operandi, non solum in generali, sed in specie & individuo, sunt considerata, tanquam unicum objectum totale divina prædestinationis, ita ut nihil omnino sit quod subterfugiat illius objecti latitudinem, & quod non cadat sub actu illo prædestinationis.*

4. *Si electorum prædestinatio futura non esset, nihil esset omnino in rerum natura. Itaque statuo tanquam certum, quod nisi Christus futurus esset in mundo, nulla fuisset à Deo facta electorum prædestinatio, non existente autem prædestinatione, ex cujus vi secuta sunt omnia, non esset cælum, non terra, non reliqua elementa, non viventia, non homines, non Angeli, non peccata, non demones, non reprobi, & demum, ut uno totum verbo absolvam, solus Deus esset, & nihil aliud esset à Deo, neque naturale neque supernaturale, neque bonum neque malum; loquimur secundum communem rerum legem & ordinem, & juxta eos fines quos probabiliter suspicamus Deum habuisse in creaturarum conditione. Nam nequaquam intendimus divina potentie majestatem sic nosse imbecillitatis captui alligare, ut negemus potuisse Deum quæ sua est absoluta potentia, naturam rerum independentem à gratia & gloria, & gratiam independentem à Christo Domino facere & ordinare.*

Then hee proceeds to shew, how many, seeming to favour this opinion of his, yet take quite contrary courses in the maintenance thereof, such as tend rather to the destruction of it; and they are in number five.

Hence hee proceeds to the justification of his owne Tenet: and his first confirmation is derived from that of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 3. 13. *All are yours, and yee are Christs, and Christ is Gods.* Ecce ubi (saith hee) qua ratione Christus dicitur esse Dei, & prædestinati dicuntur esse ipsius Christi; eadem ratione omnia naturalia, sive presentia, sive futura, sive vita, sive mors, dicuntur esse prædestinatorum: Sed sic est, quod idè dicitur Christus esse Dei, & electi

electi dicuntur esse Christi, quia Deus est finis Christi, & Christus electorum, id est, quia Christus ordinatur in Deum tanquam in finem, & electi in Christum tanquam in finem: & nisi esset ille primus finis, id est, Deus, vel manifestatio gloria Dei, non esset Christus; & nisi esset Christus, non essent electi: ergo omnino eadem ratione creatura idè dicuntur esse electorum, quia sunt propter electos, & electi sunt fines earum; & sic nisi essent futuri electi, non essent natura creaturarum, &c.

His second prooffe is taken from that *Ephes. 1.4. Elegit nos in ipso ante mundi constitutionem. Loquitur vero de Christo homine, viz. de Christo capite, ut expresse ibi dicit Hieronymus, & ex contextu apertissime liquet. Certè, aut ego fallor, aut D. Paulus non id tantum intendit, quod, viz. nos Deus in Christo elegerit ante veram & realem mundi constitutionem, quæ fuit abhinc sex mille annis in tempore facta. Quod enim nos in Christo elegisset ante illam temporariam rerum creationem, non erit quid magnum & tanto calamo dignum; Sic enim etiam boves & lapides elegit: i. decrevit & prævidit ante temporariam rerum creationem, quandoquidem priusquam in tempore quidquam faceret, jam illud ante mundi constitutionem & ab æterno excogitaverat ac decreverat ut faceret; aliquid ergo altius & divinius Paulus intendit, nempe, quod in sua Deus æternitate cum excogitavit de constituendo mundo, jam prius ordine rationis excogitaverat de electione electorum, jam (inquam) Christum intenderat & præviderat, & in ipso prædestinatos elegerat.*

Other places hee drawes to the same purpose, and concludes with the Argument of *Scot*, which in his judgement is *ratio efficacissima*; *Omnis ordinatè volens prius vult finem, & ex mediis ea prius quæ sunt fini propinquiora: Sed Christus & prædestinati, ac proinde omnia supernaturalia sunt fini, id est, manifestationi divinæ bonitatis, propinquiora quam omnia naturalia, ergo prius quam naturalia volita sunt à Deo supernaturalia, & his prius manifestatio ipsa divinæ bonitatis, quam consideramus ut horum omnium finem, &c.*

And withall, hee shewes that himselfe is not alone in this opinion, but that the same is maintained by *Jacobus Naclantus*, upon the 1. Ch. of *Eph.* in a digression, *Quo ordine & ratione de rebus definitum fuerit apud Deum. Albertus Pigh. lib. 8. de lib. Arb. cap. 3. & lib. 1. in initio. Ambrosius Catarinus lib. 1. de eximia*

Whether Gods intention of glorifying Christ

Prædest. Christi. Petrus Galatinus lib.7. de Arcanis Cathol. veritatis, à cap.3.ad 9.

But withall, hee observes a doubt, the solution whereof must not bee pretermitted; that is, whether this opinion can be maintained according to the doctrine of *Aquinas*; for, saith he, pag.16. *S. Thomas existimat, minimè Christi prædestinationem futuram si homo non peccasset. Ex quo fieri videtur consequens, prius visum à Deo fuisse peccatum, & volitam ejus permissionem, quam volita fuisset incarnatio Verbi: atque adè non apparet quomodo in via Thomistarum stare possit, quod primum omnium decretorum Dei fuerit incarnatio seu prædestinatio Verbi, si jam præcesset peccati visio atque permissio. Si verò priusquam peccatum videretur fuit Christus prædestinatus, jam ergo etiam non existente peccato, Christus, qui ante visum peccatum prædestinatus fuerat, veniret: Quod directè pugnat cum doctrina S. Thomæ.*

By the way, I observe a vaine supposition to bee the ground of all this perturbation, and conflictation of contrary opinions, in this Argument: And the presupposition is this, That the decree of Christs incarnation and of our predestination, as also of creation, and of the permission of sinne, cannot bee coördinate and *simultanea*, but must needs bee subordinate and one before another. And so hee carrieth himselfe in the confirmation of the priority of those decrees which hee fancieth to be before the other, as chiefly to oppose the priority of the others. And this I account a very vain supposition, (though, I confesse, for many years I was carried away with the common error, and therewithall still found my selfe in a brake or labyrinth, without hope of extricating my selfe) as I have here proved in part, but elsewhere more at large. But as for the solution of the doubt proposed, his answer is this, *Prius Deum voluisse unionem hypostaticam & incarnationem Verbi, quam vellet permittere peccatum, & quam vellet condere naturam hominis & totius universi.* But I have already demonstrated the falsity of this. But hee proceeds, *Quia tamen non est volita incarnatio sine peccato, imo dependenter est volita à permissione peccati, & à natura rerum tanquam à mediis; idcirco non sequitur, futurum esse Christum si peccatum non esset, aut si universum non esset.* Two things he constitutes *media tendentia ad incarnationem Christi*; and indeed, if the incarnation of Christ were first in intention, as the end, all other things intended after, must bee intended as
meanes:

meanes : But I have already shewed how absurdly the creation of mankind is constituted as a meanes of Christs incarnation : and is it not strange, that the making of every worme, or a gnat, should be a meanes tending to the incarnation of Christ? In like sort, I have shewed the absurdity of conceiving the permission of sinne to be a means of Christs glorification, much more of his incarnation.

Hee proceeds to remove some other rubs out of the way, but in such a vaine manner, that it were the wasting of time to make relation thereof ; neither can I well give account for proceeding so farre as I have done, onely I desired to shew the Authours of this opinion, which here I confute : And I have entertained sometimes a thought of taking occasion to discusse this whole dissertation of *Alphonsus* ; but more necessary businessse have hitherunto taken up my meditations.

And I hope that which I have here delivered may suffice to the cutting off of the very sinewes of that discourse : if not, I shall not be avcrse from taking further paines, as I shall see cause, and opportunity, and God shall inable me.

Much lesse is it my meaning to disparage, or under-value the love of God toward the elect, in that I set forth Christ as not first thought upon by God for the elect sake ; for though I doe not preferre his love to us before the love of Christ, yet is the love of God to us unspeakable and glorious ; not only in preferring us before the world of other men, and the rest of the creatures, but also in thinking upon us in Christ, upon whom Christ should shew forth the riches of his gracious love and tender mercy.

Ans.

I confesse, there is no colour of disparaging Gods love to us by giving the precedency of Gods love to Christ, especially when both are acknowledged to be eternall, and to be toward both the man Christ and us, before wee or the world had a being ; most of all, when in the issue the priority seems to be for us, rather then for Christ : for it is confest, that priority in Gods decrees consists onely in purposing one thing for another. And again, it is without question, that all priority in this case is on the part of that for which another thing is purposed. Now albeit wee are Christs servants, and hee our Lord ; yet, undoubtedly, Christ was ordained rather for our good, then wee for his good : yet I doe not hence collect, that our predestination was before Christs ; much lesse, that Gods
love

1 Tim. i. : 6.
Exam.

Sinne the cause of Christs humiliation.

love was lesse towards him then towards us; but I willingly acknowledge, that albeit thousands had tasted of Gods love, both in the way of nature, and grace, and glory, before Christ-man had any being at all; yet was the love of God to the manhood of Christ infinitely beyond his love towards us, measuring the love of God by the effects thereof: and that in two respects; first, for as much as the fruit of Gods love to him was the taking of his humane nature into an hypostaticall union with the Sonne of God: secondly, in making him the Captain of our salvation, *Heb. 2.10.*

Ans.

Least of all is it my meaning to extenuate the heinous nature of sinne, by setting forth the purpose of God, concerning the incarnation of Christ, before the consideration of the fall of Adam: It is enough to make sinne out of measure sinfull, that God in his wisdom saw no means so fit, as by the sinne and fall of Adam, to make way for the humiliation of Christ, and thereby for the manifestation of his justice, and riches of his mercy, and both in Christ; although we grant, so far as to conceive, that God had never thought of humbling the Godhead, or advancing the manhood of Christ, but upon consideration of sin fore-seen.

Exam.

Ex magnitudine remedii, magnitudinem cognosce periculi, saith Bernard; this hath place, in what order soever Christ was ordained a Sacrifice for sinne; neither is there any colour of remitting ought of the heinousnesse of sin, by the priority or posteriority of Christs predestination, in comparison to Gods decree, concerning the permission of sinne. Sinne, and the heinousnesse thereof is amplified according to the quality of the transgression, in reference to Gods law, so honourable a rule of mans perfection, and to Gods deserts at our hands, and plentifull motives from consideration both of rewards and punishments, wherewith it is establisht. It is a common and just aggravation of sinne, that it caused the Son of God to be humbled; but to aggravate it in making way for Christs humiliation, is a very odde conceit, in my judgement. Neither doe I comprehend, how the manifestation of justice in punishing sinne, or of mercy in pardoning it, doth aggravate the heinousnesse of sin: This, I say, I comprehend not.

The second DOUBT.

WHere have wee, in Scripture, ground for this, That the Lords first and primary intention, in his decree of Predestination, was to set forth Grace and Justice? That the declaration of his justice was intended, is not doubted, but by the Apostle it seemeth, his primary aime was the declaration of the sovereignty, freedom, and dominion of God over the creature, in that hee purposeth grace and power.

The Apostle throughout his whole discourse of Predestination, doth no where oppose grace and power; for God sheweth as much power, freedome, and dominion over the creature, in his grace toward the elect, as in his justice toward the world: The Apostle sets forth the like power and sovereign will of God, as well in shewing mercy on whom hee will, as hardening whom hee pleaseth. Doe not think hee opposeth Gods power and sovereignty over Pharaoh, to his grace and love unto Jacob: for the power hee there speaks of, is not sovereignty, but ability, might, and power, shewing it selfe forth in the hardening and overthrow of Pharaoh; in Moyses called the power of his wrath. Power naturall is one thing, power civill, which wee call sovereignty, another: the first is, ability to doe a thing; the second is, liberty to doe what naturally hee can doe, without sinne. Undoubtedly, the power of God shewed in Pharaoh, was in his overthrow, and answerable to the power of Gods wrath.

I like well that the power of God shewed in Pharaoh, is extended also to the hardening of his heart; onely, this is not so congruously applied to the power of Gods wrath, for as much as wrath hath alwayes reference to something in man, as the cause of it; so hath not hardening: in that of Paul, Rom. 9. 18. *Hee hardeneth whom hee will, like as, hee hath mercy on whom hee will.* But withall, I confesse, hardening in this place seems to consist onely in denying of mercy: But Pharaohs hardening was much more; for, undoubtedly, mercy was no more shewed him when his heart relented to the letting of Israel goe, then when hee detained them. So likewise, when God hardened him to follow after them, to

F

bring

Whether Gods primary aime in Predestination,

bring them back, this was more than a bare denying of mercy, even a secret impulsion of him to take such courses as should precipitate him unto destruction: and this may well be accounted a fruit of the power of Gods wrath; and accordingly I am verily perswaded, that Gods power or sovereignty over *Pharaoh*, are not opposed to his grace and love to *Jacob*: Onely, freedome, in my judgement, doth not so well consent with the execution of justice, whether justice be taken in rewarding or punishing. Neither doe wee ever read of Gods rewarding or punishing whom hee will; freedome and sovereignty is seen only in giving or denying good, according to common account: Albeit, there is a further freedom and sovereignty of God, over his creatures, in doing evill unto them; as in annihilating the most righteous, which *Arminius* acknowledgeth, and in exposing his holy Son to suffer strange pains and sorrowes, for other mens finnes, when hee had none of his owne. Not to speak of the sovereignty wherewith God hath indued man over his fellowes, though inferiour creatures.

Answ.

That God in his decree of Predestination did shew forth the declaration of his sovereignty, freedome, and dominion over the creatures, I easily grant; yet that it was his primary aime, rather then the declaration of his justice and grace, I cannot beleeve, without better proofe.

Examin.

My opinion is, That all the variety of Gods glory, to bee manifested in the creature, was intended at once; and if they that are otherwise minded come to a particular expression of what glory was intended first, and what next, and so in order, I am perswaded the incongruity of that order will soon appear.

Answ.

It is granted on all hands, that God first aimed at the declaration of his owne glory: Now, wherein doth God delight principally for to manifest his glory? God himselfe declared it to Moses, who desired him to shew him his glory; The Lord, saith hee, mercifull, and gracious, and that will by no means cleare the guilty, visiting iniquity: Where God declareth, and proclaimeth his chiefe glory to stand partly of attributes, and the work of grace in the one hand, and of justice in the other; for God in like sort declareth wherein hee delighteth chiefly to glorifie himselfe, viz. in the exercise of loving kindnesse, and righteousness, and judgement, Jer. 9.24.

Exod. 34.
6, 7.

Examin.

I should think whatsoever is in God is equally glorious, even his strength as well as his mercy, wherewith the Lord begins, in
the

the* place alledged, though here pretermitted : Neither doth it follow, that because these only are here mentioned, therefore the glory of God doth principally consist in these. And besides, there is the glory of his sovereignty expressed, even then when the promise of this revelation (here mentioned) was made to *Moses* ; to wit, in shewing mercy, and having compassion on whom hee will. *I beseech thee, shew mee thy glory : And hee answered, I will make all my good goe before thee, and I will proclaime the Name of the Lord before thee ; for I will shew mercy to whom I will shew mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.* And this is it the Apostle doth most insist upon, *Rom.9.* yet I make no question but *πολυτρόπος ὁ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*, the various wisdom of God, is as glorious as any of the rest ; and this appeareth in the incarnation of the Sonne of God, and in the complete execution of his office, as in nothing more. But, I conceive, that glory of God represented to *Moses*, *Exod.34.6,7.* was expressed to a speciall end unto his people, namely, to compose them to a greater reverence of his Majesty ; which reverence is a quality consisting of a mixture of love and feare, a morall gesture. Not to speak how the execution of mercy and justice are competent unto the creature, nor to mention that wherein *Vasquez* and *Suarez* concur, otherwise much different, about their conceptions of Gods justice, namely, that there is no justice in God toward the creature which is not grounded upon the determination of his will ; and so, undoubtedly, is the execution of his mercy also ; onely with this difference, God hath revealed unto us rules, according to which hee will proceed in the execution of his justice ; no such rules hath hee revealed to us, or prescribed to himselfe, according to which he will proceed in the execution of his mercy.

*Exod. 34 6.

Exod. 31.
28, 29.

It is well observed by others, that those vertues which grace the Will, are more honourable than those which grace the Understanding, or other parts : It is a greater honour to a Prince to be gracious and just, then to bee wise and powerfull ; power and wisdom may bee found in a vitious Prince, not grace and justice : If then grace and justice doe more set forth the glory of their sovereignty, surely God (who aimeth at his highest glory) in the highest and first place, he aimed chiefly at the manifestation of his grace and justice, above the manifestation of his power and dominion.

Answ.

Whether God chiefly aimed at the glory

Examin.

1. First concerning the instance it selfe, I answer 1. It is not to be expected, I confesse, that vertue should be found in a vitious person; but yet Princes commonly make more accompt of their absolutenesse, then of their vertue. 2. And the most capitall crime against them, consists rather in the derogation to their power, then to their vertue. 3. And vertue is common to all; and if all were as they ought to be, what glory were it to a King to be vertuous? 2. But as for the accomodation of it, though all were granted, yet it concludes nothing. To be vertuous is honourable to a man, because he is indifferent to execute his power, in the way of vice, as well as in the way of vertue: But there is no such indifferency found in God. Gods gracious disposition tyes him to doe good to none, but to whom he will. Had he never made the world, nor purposed to produce any creature, he had bene notwithstanding the same he now is; yea the very execution of justice in God, doth presuppose the determination of his owne will: whereupon it is that *Bradwardine* distinguisheth betweene *meritum aptitudinale*, & *meritum actuale*. *Aptitudinale meritum* is the merit of such good, as God can bestow in the way of reward, if he will; or such evill as God can inflict in the way of punishment, if he will. *Actuale meritum* is the merit of such good or evill, as God hath determined to bestow, or inflict; Answerable hereunto *Gerson* professeth, that when a sinne is committed, it is meerey at the pleasure of God to inflict what punishment he will. And withall he professeth, that God doth actually remunerate every good worke *ultra condignum*, and punish every evill worke *citra condignum*; all which I hold to be Orthodox, and sound. And let me intreat and prevaile with you, in this, that you will not thinke any thing in the nature of God to be lesse glorious then another, howsoever, to our apprehension, some attributes, may seem more glorious then others.

Answ.

Consider what you finde last in the execution of Gods decree, and from thence gather, what was first in his intention. Now at the last judgement, as likewise in the course of his providence in this world, God doth chiefly manifest the glory of his grace to the elect, and the glory of his justice upon the world. When God in his wayes towards the elect, bleisseth them with all spirituall blessings in Christ, what doth he rather aime at, then the praise of the glory of his grace? When God destroyeth the Wicked in their flourishing estate,

estate, and causeth the righteous to flourish, in their weak and decayed age; what doth he rather aime at, then to shew that the Lord is upright, and there is noe unrighteousnesse with him? When Christ shall come to judgement at the last day, what will he rather shew forth, then the righteous judgement of God upon the world of the ungodly; and the admirable glory of his grace to the Saints? Since then, all the wayes of God doe finally worke to this issue, the setting forth of his grace, and justice; surely we are so to conceive it, as his primary aime and intent to be, to glorifie rather his grace and justice, then his power and sovereignty.

1. That God doth manifest the glory of his grace to the elect, and the glory of his justice upon the world, both in this life, and at the day of judgement, I grant; But that he doth chiefly manifest this, is not proved: save only there is a propension in the phrase, to signifie, as much, as properly, and then it is true indeed. His grace properly on the one, his justice properly on the other; whereas the glory of his power, and sovereignty, and wisdom, is promiscuously shewed on both, yet there is not taken so distinct a consideration of justice, as seems fit: For whereas justice is as well remunerative, as vindicative; as this hath place only on the wicked, so the other on the good; I meane those, that departed the world after they came to yeares of discretion: yet consider, I pray you, what thinke you of them that perish in no other sinne but originall, derived unto them by the fall of *Adam*, which *Adam* we beleeve to be saved? In the condemnation of these what glory of God doth appeare more, either of his justice, or of his sovereignty?

2. But be it granted, that these glories doe appeare chiefly at such times; yet if other glories doe appeare also in the same last execution, how will you deduce herehence, that only those glories you mention were first in intention? Will it not rather follow, that seeing other glories, as well as these, did appeare in execution though not chiefly, therefore other glories, as well as these, were first in intention, though not chiefly?

3. When God blest his elect, with all spirituall blessings in Christ, we need not say, he aimes rather at somewhat else then the praise of the glory of his grace: when out of mere grace he made his glorious selfe known unto us, he made not only his grace known unto us, but all his attributes more or lesse, which to

The reasons moving Mr. Cotton to depart

our understanding are equally glorious in themselves, though we take more comfort in the speculation of his grace; which yet is more wonderfull, when we consider his sovereignty over us his creatures, and that it was indifferent to him to make us vessels of wrath, as well as vessels of mercy: and in this very consideration, the very damnation of reprobates shall improve our glorious joyes in the apprehension of Gods free love to us at the day of judgement, according to that of the Apostle, *Rom. 9. 22.* You are to looke to it, how you make your Tenent good, who maintaine that God doth rather aime at the one, then at the other.

4. As for the wicked, the righteousness of Gods judgement upon them, we can in some measure conceive at this present: But as for the power of God in executing such judgements, maintaining the creature, in the suffering of eternall torrows, wee are not able to conceive, and therefore the glory hereof is farre more admirable then the other. So likewise, what shall be the fruits of the grace of God towards us at that day and after, *neither eye hath seene, nor eare hath heard, &c.* nor that glory contained in seeing the face of God. If God should but reveale unto us the wisdom whereby he hath managed his providence towards us before he called us, and since the calling of us, immediatly by himselfe, immediatly by the ministry of good Angels, contending with, and crossing the counsells and practises of wicked Angels; what a body of glory would appeare unto us, and how should we be ravished with the contemplation of it? How much more with the contemplation of his providence thoroughout, both in managing the whole course of nature, and the whole course of grace?

QUESTION 2.

Quest. 2.

How and by what demonstrative reasons, may it appeare that there is a necessity of a departing from the doctrine delivered in our Church.

Answer.

The reasons, which moved me a little, and but a little to depart from the forme of words usually received in delivering the doctrine of Reprobation, are such as to me seeme, if not demonstrative, yet convincing. And though I have learned to suspect mine owne judgement where I differ never so little from my godly and reve-

reverend learned Brethren; yet I consider, we are taught to trie all things likewise, and to hold fast that which is good; and as wee believe, so to speake, submitting our selves to the feare of God. But before I come to the ground, wherupon I have beene led to believe, and speake somewhat otherwise of this point, then is commonly received; let me first shew you how farre I consent with the received opinion, even in all usefull truthes; and how little it is then wherein I dissent. In the doctrine of election, I consent wholly with Augustine, Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Zanchy, Perkins, Paræus, and others, who have taught us, by plaine evidence, and that from scripture:

1. That, before the world was, God out of his free will hath chosen the elect by name, by an unchangeable decree, unto grace and glory in Christ Iesus, to the shewing forth of the riches of the glory of his grace.

2. That to restore them, who were lost in Adam, he sent forth the Lord Iesus, to be obedient to the death for them, and by his death, to redeeme them as effectually, as if they themselves had suffered in their owne persons.

3. That in the fulnesse of time, he calleth each one of them, by an effectuall and invincible drawing, even by such an almighty worke of his quickning spirit, as he did put forth in raising Christ from the dead.

4. That those, whom he so calleth, he preserveth by some powerfull worke of his spirit to himselfe in Christ, so as they never fall from him totally, or finally: Only herein take it not amisse, if I place the subject of Election in Persons considered in Christ, before the world, or themselves were, and not in massa corrupta, with the Lite venerable Synod. For though herein they follow Augustine, and Zanchy, and some others; yet have they dissented from the chiefe instruments, of the reformation of our Religion. And, with reverence I speake it, as I am led to conceive, that it need not trouble any, if, taking Christ to be the head of the elect, I conceive him to be first thought upon, and chosen, and we in him. Mr. Baynes followeth the schoole in so expressing it; and the reasons delivered above in the first point, have carryed me with them: and the difference lyeth in opening the purpose of Reprobation. But see here how farre I goe with the streame, and, when I goe aside, how little, and upon what ground.

How

Different opinions about the object of Predestination.

How convincing, or demonstrative, the reasons are, I address myself to consider : It is good to make progress in the investigation of truth. *Austin* professeth himself to be of the number of those *qui proficiendo scribunt, & scribendo proficiunt* : only our care must be, that we goe not backward, and make things worse then wee found them ; which comes to passe (especially with good men) many times, not so much by falling into error, as by confusion of method ; for hereby it comes to passe, that the passages opening the way to the investigation of truth, are stopt up, and we find our selves in a brake, and see no way out. To prevent them, I am perswaded, it is a profitable consideration, to thinke with our selves, that different opinions, especially amongst godly Divines, may be no other then the dividing of the truth betweene them.

About the object of predestination there hath bin a triple difference in opinion : some standing for *massa nondum vendita* ; others for *massa pura*, that is *condita* but *nondum corrupta* ; others for *massa corrupta* : yet both *Junius* did endeavour : but very obscurely ; and *Piscator* hath endeavoured very perspicuously to reduce them into one. If he failed therein, especially in some one particular, his failing, rightly observed and discerned, may open a way for the discovery of the entire truth. But let the issue thereof commend it selfe. Your phrase of usefull truths I do not like ; amongst *Arminians*, I often meet with such a course of arguing truth, by the usefulness of it ; which is like the giving of the larger coat to him that is bigger, because it is fitter for him, when in the mean time he had no right unto it.

And though we can judge aright of a coats fitnessse to a body ; yet it is a dangerous course for us, to presume so farre of our judgements in the usefulness of opinions, as thereupon to conclude what are true, and what are false.

I. To choose before the world, is to choose before the creation, or *Adams* fall, according to your owne exposition, formerly mentioned : but in this sense, your selfe confesseth in the 4. place, that *Austin* and *Zanchy* doe not concurre with others in this ; was there no more in Gods intention, when he elected some, then the manifestation of the riches of his glorious grace ? Did not God purpose to manifest also the glory of his remunerative justice ? Is it not undeniable, that God will bestow salvation upon all his elect

elect (of ripe yeares, before their departure out of this world) by way of reward, and crowne of righteousness, which God the righteous Judge shall give at that day to all that love his Sonnes appearing? It being a righteous thing with God, as to recompence tribulation to them that trouble his Children; so to his Children that are troubled, rest with his Apostles: *when the Lord Jesus shall shew himselfe from Heaven, with his mighty Angels, in flaming fire, rendring vengeance &c. When he shall come to be glorified in his Saints, and be made marvellous, in all them that beleve &c.* It is great pity this is not considered (as usually it is not) especially for the momentous consequence thereof, in my judgement, sufficient (if I mistake not) to have stilled this opinion following, touching Reprobation, in the first conception of it.

2 Tim 4.

2 Thessa. 1

2. Touching the Second, I have nothing to say; for if you have any opinion concerning some benefit that redounds to the Reprobate by the death of Christ, it is more then hitherto you do discover.

3. Touching the Third, it were to be desired you did expresse, whether no lesse powerfull motion, would serve to the drawing of them to faith and repentance.

4. Likewise touching the Fourth, whether this powerfull worke being denied to any, it is possible for such a one to beleve, and repent unto salvation. Concerning the order here mentioned, though my opinion be, that the object of predestination is *massa nondum condita*, yet in no moment of nature, or reason, was the decree of God concerning Christs incarnation, and our salvation by him, before the decree of creation, and of permission of Adams fall, and consequently Election unto Salvation had the consideration of *massa corrupta* concomitant with it, though not precedent; only the consideration of *massa nondum condita* being antecedentall to all these decrees. Likewise, in my opinion, they doe mistake, who take the Synod of Dort to maintaine the consideration of *massa corrupta*, as precedent to Election, though they beginne with signifying what God purposed to bring to passe, upon the fall of mankind, in Adam. And Calvin in his answer to Pighius confesseth, that the safest course is to treat of predestination, upon the consideration of the corrupt masse in Adam. As touching what you have delivered, touching Election in Christ our head, in the first place, that I have already examin'd.

Our Divines commonly conceive, a double act of Reprobation, Aufw.

Of the two acts of Reprobation, viz.

as Bellarmine, and others of the Papists doe.

1. Negative, as they call it, a non-election, or Reprobation; unto which some adde a purpose of forsaking the creature, excluding it from glory, and from sufficient meanes of grace in Christ.

2. Positive, ordaining it to condemnation.

The former, they conceive to be absolute, as being an act of Gods soveraigne Lordship over the creature, without all respect to sinne.

The latter they conceive, as being an act of vindicative justice, to presuppose originall sinne at the least, and some of them (as Bellarmine) actual sinne also, whom Paraus in this point seemeth to give way unto.

1. To the first of these acts I wholly assent so farre as it resteth in a non-election, or preterition of the creature, according to the libertie of Gods absolute soveraignety. That which is added to it, of a purpose of forsaking the creature, and to exclude it, from glory, and from sufficient meanes of grace in Christ, before all respect of sinne, I want warrant from scripture to condescend unto. But this Negative act, I would rather expresse in such words as the holy Ghost hath used before me, and so distinguish it into two branches.

That before all respect of good or evil in the creature:

1. God did not so love the world, (I meane the world of mankind distinguished from the elect:) this is plaine from the Apostles comparison, of Jacob and Esau. Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.

2. God did not give the world to Christ, by him of grace to be brought to salvation, as he did the elect, for they are not said to be written in the Lambs book of life, from the beginning of the world. Revel. 13. 8, 17, 18. And indeed all who were given to Christ, doe, in fulnesse of time, come unto him. Ioh. 6. 37. Gods hatred of Esau, before he had done good or evil, reacheth to this act also. Rom. 9. 13.

2. Touching the positive act, which they conceive, I wholly agree with them, that God ordaineth none to condemnation, but upon sinne presupposed. Annihilation is an act of Soveraignety, futeable to creation; but condemne it he may not, without presupposall of sinne. For condemnation is an act of justice, and presupposeth a rule of justice transgressed, and thereby wrath, or just revenge.

venge provoked: onely this positive act of Gods counsell about the world of mankind severed from the elect, upon serious consideration of sundry passages of Scripture, I would rather distinguish into a double act.

1. Whereby, without all respect of good or evil in the men of this world, God ordained them unto judgment, according to their works. Ezech. 33. 20. to judgment, I say, not of condemnation; which presupposeth sinne in the creature to be condemned; but judgment (I meane) of just retribution, whereby God is willing to deale with them, according to their works in justice; justice I say, as well distributive, to reward them with life, if they continue in obedience; as vindicative, to punish them to death; if they provoke him by carelesse and wilfull disobedience.

Hitherto, even to this act, the hatred of God to Esau reached.

2. Whereby, upon the presupposall of the carelesse or wilfull disobedience of the world, either in refusing the meanes of grace in Christ, or abusing other talents and helps of the knowledge of God in nature, God rejecteth, or reprobateeth them from all hope of life, and purposeth to condemne them for their finnes, to the glorifying of his power, justice and wrath.

Non-election, absolute is an act of soveraignitie, you grant; which also you call preterition. Let us speake distinctly, that the the fairer way may be opened, to the discovery of truth and error. Preterition may be in time; as when, in giving grace to some, God passeth by others: or it may have place as well in not purposing to give grace to some, when he doth purpose to give grace to others, which purpose of his was from everlasting; and preterition in this sense, is all one with non-election. Now this non-election is either a negation of election unto grace, or a negation of election unto glory; It is here proposed indefinitely, and I conceive it is understood of both. Now it is true, that *John Scot*, and *Francis Mayro* after him, did sometimes shape the order of Gods decrees in this manner: In the first instant of nature, *Peter* and *Judas* being offered to the divine consideration, *Deus volebat Petro gloriam, nihil volebat Judæ*; in the second instant, *Deus volebat Petro gratiam, nihil volebat Judæ*; In the third instant, *Deus volebat utrumque existere in massa corrupta*; wherehence it followeth in the last place, (sayeth hee) that the one shall infallibly be saved, the other damned. This sometimes seemed plausible to me, and I did pre-

Examine.

ferre it, and still doe, before the perverse orders of Gods decrees devised by many : For, *est quiddam prodire tenns* : we have the shorter way to our journeyes end. But in what instant shall God *veller Judæ damnationem* ? not till after all this ? If it be last in intention, shall it not be first in execution, according to your owne rules, so much insisted on in the first place ? The *Dominicans* and particularly *Alvarez* professeth in opposition to these negative decrees of *Scotus*, that the decree of reprobation is positive; and one reason amongst others is this, because if reprobation were meerly negative, then all men and Angels possible, though never existent, might be justly said to be reprobate as well as the reprobate men and Angels that are or shall be existent. For it is most true, that they are *non electi*, in as much as one of contradictions is verified *de omni ente, & non ente* ; therefore certainly there goes more to reprobation then a meere negation of election. And, in my judgment, this reason of his is a weighty reason. Therefore they profess plainly, that God did not only *not purpose* to give *Judas* glory, but he did purpose to deny him glory, that is, ordaine that he should be without glory : Secondly, that he did not only not purpose to give him grace, but also did purpose to deny him grace, or ordaine, that he should be without grace, at least without such grace as should bring him to salvation. And indeed if God doth purpose that *Judas* shall exist in the corrupt mass, and withall doth not purpose to give him grace and glory, doth it not manifestly follow, that he shall exist without grace and glory ? For how shall he come by glory or grace, if not from God ? Or how shall God deny him one or other, but according to the Counsell of his will, seeing he workes all things according to the counsell of his will ? Therefore God did not only not purpose that he should have grace and glory, but did positively purpose that he should be without both : and it is *Bradwardins* opinion, that no pure negative act can be attributed unto God, but such as is equivalently resolved into an act positive, thus, If *Deus non volebat gloriam Judæ*, then *Deus volebat illi non gloriam* ; that is, that he should not have glory : so of grace, so of existence ; if God did not will the existency of more Angels then are, it followes that God did will that more Angels then are should not exist ; and that this positive act doth better become the nature of God, then the former negative, by reason of his most perfect actuality. And as for

for the purpose of forsaking the creature, and excluding it from glory; that is no other then Gods purpose not to give certaine creatures any such grace, as whereby they shall be brought to glory: And seeing this is acknowledged by you, I see no cause why you should stick in acknowledging a purpose of God to forsake some creatures, and exclude them from glory. It is pity, that the prejudice of phrases, whereby it is expressed, should strangle any doctrine, when there lyes no just exception against it, as untrue in the substance thereof. When you confesse, that God did not so love the world, as the elect (which is no more, then to acknowledge a non-election of some) if you expound it in reference unto his purpose of not giving grace and glory unto them, as to the elect; *Aquinas* himselfe acknowledgeth, that *odisse* in Scripture phrase is no other then *non velle alicui gratiam & gloriam*. And it is well knowne that Mr. *Moulin* doth as eagerly oppose this absolute reprobation negative, as absolute reprobation positive: For he manifestly perceives, that damnation follows as infallibly, and unavoidably upon that doctrine of reprobation negative, as upon this of reprobation positive.

If you conceive, that God did give the world to Christ, by him of grace to be bought to some kind of grace, though not to salvation, as he did the elect; I doubt you are not able to bring any sufficient reason to justify this; wherehence it will follow, that Christs death was meritorious unto them, but not satisfactorie; or if satisfactorie, yet onely for some sinnes of theirs, but not for all.

As touching the act positive of reprobation, I trust when all things are rightly stated, there will appeare to be as little reason, why there should be any difference between us in this act, as in the former. For what, I pray, is the meaning of this, *God ordaines none to condemnation, but upon sinne presupposed*? Is there any other meaning of the words then this; God hath ordained that no man shall be condemned, but for sinne? who ever denied this? What one of our Divines, or Papists, or of any Sect, ever called this into question? But herehence it only followes, that sinne is the cause of condemnation, and that by the ordination of God: it follows not, that sin is the cause of Gods ordination; although I confesse the confusion of these is most frequent amongst our Divines, amongst Papists, though otherwise very learned, and chiefly among the *Arminians*, for the advantage of their cause;

Whether ordination to condemnation

yet see not a farre greater advantage to their cause then any yet hath been taken hold of by any one of them : And this confusion alone is that which sets our Divines together by the eares, not considering the dangerous consequence here-hence, utterly overthrowing the Orthodox doctrine of our Churches, in the very point of Election, and bringing in *Arminianisme* entire and whole ; not in Reprobation only, as Master *Moulin* doth, and you seeme to doe ; but in Election it selfe unavoidably, though hitherto, I confesse, the *Arminians* have not been so happy as to discern it. I doubt not but your meaning is, in that Proposition, That sinne is not only the cause of damnation, but of Gods decree also of ordaining thereunto. But to affirme this, seemed so foule to *Aquinas*, (namely, that there should be conceived a cause of Gods will, or Gods decree) that hee professeth, never any man was so madde as to affirme it. But because the saying of *Aquinas* moves you little ; why should it, seeing it little hindered not onely *Valentianus* the Jesuite from saying as you doe, but *Alvarez* also the *Thomist*, and a great *Thomist* ? therefore I will proceed further : What should move you to affirme, That, to ordaine to condemnation is an act of vindicative justice ? Condemnation, I grant, is an act of vindicative justice, like as remuneration is an act of justice remunerative ; but will it follow here-hence, that to ordaine to condemnation is an act of vindicative justice ? I will not presse you with the authority of Master *Baynes*, who denyes Reprobation to be an act of justice ; but thus I dispute : If Gods purpose to condemne to death, be an act of justice vindicative ; then also Gods purpose to remunerate with eternall life, is an act of justice remunerative : And if Gods purpose of condemnation presuppose sinne, it follows, that Gods purpose of remunerating with eternall life must also presuppose obedience ; even obedience of faith, repentance, and good works ; for all these God doth remunerate with eternall life. Here appeareth the foule tayle of *Arminianisme*, in the doctrine of Election, which this plausible doctrine of yours and of Master *Moulins*, in the point of Reprobation, drawes after it. The consequence is manifest, though few or none consider it, even of them that are both Orthodox in Election, and most versed in the examining and discerning of just consequences. Now because this consequence, I presume, is unexpected, I imagine men may be moved to cast about, and consider how they may wind themselves

out

out of this dangerous inconvenience. And perhaps it may come to their mindes to affirme, that they doe not conceive Election under this forme; namely, to bee the decree of God to remunerate with everlasting life. And I verily believe they doe not; for if they did, it were not possible they should continue Orthodox in the point of Election; but miserably betray their cause, by giving way to a doctrine (plainly contradictory) in the point of Reprobation. But why then doe they not consider Election as they ought? Is it not generally confessed, that Election and Reprobation are contrary? why then should they not be shapen under contrariant formes? and what act, I pray you, is contrary to the act of justice vindicative, but the act of justice remunerative? But perhaps you may say, Though this bee true, yet there is no place for such an opposition here; for as much as though a man may merit damnation by sinne, yet hee cannot merit salvation by obedience. I answer therefore, that this onely shewes there can be no opposition between them in a speciall kind of retribution, to wit, in the way of retribution according to desert on both sides; yet this hinders not, but that there may be, and indeed is, an opposition in the generall of retribution: For it is well knowne, that God will reward every one according to his works; and that he means to bestow salvation upon every one of ripe yeares by way of reward, and, *tanquam coronam iustitie*, as the *Arminians* urge; and justly, though with no just advantage to their cause, but according to their shallow and unlearned conceits; as if therefore God should first fore-see their obedience, before hee should ordaine them to a reward: which yet will follow, if on the other side wee grant them, that God first fore-seeth mans sinall impenitency, and thereupon ordaines them to condemnation. Perhaps you may say, Is not the contrariety between Election and Reprobation sufficiently maintained, by saying, the one is Gods purpose ordaining to salvation; the other Gods purpose ordaining to condemnation? I confesse, it seemes so, and is generally reputed to be so: and this I take to bee the principall cause of this error; one confusion drawing on more and more after it. But, I say, there is no congruous opposition between salvation and damnation; for, to damne is either finally to punish, or to adjudge to punishment. Now, as the Negative opposition hereunto is onely not to punish, or to adjudge to punishment; so the contrary opposition hereunto

Of the difference between Election and Reprobation.

unto is to reward, or to adjudge to a reward : So that Election, as it is Gods purpose ordaining to salvation, by way of reward, is onely oppositely contrarily to Reprobation, as it signifies Gods purpose ordaining to condemnation. More fairly, and voyd of all equivocation, thus : Like as Reprobation is Gods purpose to punish with everlasting death ; so Election is Gods purpose to remunerate with everlasting life. And thus the contrariety of these acts being rightly stated, it followes as evidently, that Election must presuppose, not obedience, but the fore-sight of obedience ; as Reprobation presupposeth not sinne, but the fore-sight of sin. And thus are wee tumbled into the very gulfe of *Arminianisme*, over head and eares, before wee are aware. But it may bee this discourse of mine may raise such a Spirit as will not easily bee laid ; and hereupon some may the more profusely bee carryed to embrace *Arminianisme*, in the very point of Election also ; because, as Reprobation seemes to bee an act of justice vindicative ; so Election also, as here it is stated, seemes to bee an act of justice remunerative. And I willingly confesse, I never found any *Arminian* that discernes the advantage which our Divines doe afford them, by shaping the doctrine of Reprobation as they doe : Therefore I will endeavour to quiet this Spirit that I have raised, first, by discovering the Sophistry that bleares our eyes in this ; and secondly, by cleare demonstration I will prove, that no fore-sight of sinne and obedience can precede the purpose of God ordaining to salvation and damnation. As for the discovering of the Sophistry which hath place herein, consider ; first, It is agreed between *Vasquez* and *Snarez* (though otherwise much at odds about the nature of justice in God) that there is no justice in God towards his creature, but upon the presupposition of his will : whence it followeth manifestly, that the purposes of God, being the very acts of his will, are no acts of justice, but onely the executions of these purposes may bee acts of justice ; to wit, upon the presupposition of some act or purpose of his will. And the reason her-of (not to insist wholly upon any humane authority) is manifest, for as much as in remunerating it is cleare, that God is not bound to remunerate any creature, but upon presupposition of his will ; for hee may convert him into nothing, if it please him : But if hee hath determined to reward them according to their obedience, it must needs bee so ; for as much as the Divine nature is without variable-
ness.

Condemnation not purposed upon fore-sight of Sin.

49

ness or shadow of change. So likewise, neither is God bound to punish any sinner; for hee may pardon him, if it please him; but upon supposition that hee hath determined not to leave a sinner unpunished: in this case onely is hee bound to punish. Further, I will shew, that in such acts, the condition whereof doth not depend upon the will of God, the act may be of one condition, and yet nevertheless the purpose of God to performe such an act is of another condition: As for example; the act of creation is an act of Gods almighty power; but Gods purpose to create the world is no act of power, but of will rather. So likewise, Gods act of ordering all things unto their end, in wonderfull manner, is an act of infinite wisdom; but his purpose to order all things, in so admirable manner, is no act of his wisdom, but of his free-will. Now I will demonstrate, that the fore-sight of sinne cannot be the cause of Gods purpose to condemne: For if it be the cause of Gods purpose; then either by necessity of nature, or by the free constitution of God: not by necessity of nature; for hee is naturally more prone (as *Piscator* confesseth upon *Exod* 24. 6.) to remunerate obedience, than to punish for sinne: but no man will say, that hee doth remunerate by necessity of nature; therefore neither doth hee punish sinne by necessity of nature: therefore it must be onely through the voluntary constitution of God, that sinne is the cause of ordination unto condemnation. But marke, I pray, the foule absurdity hereof; for here-hence it followes, that God did purpose that upon the fore-sight of sinne hee would purpose that men should be damned. So that the purpose of God is made the object of his purpose; and that upon a certaine condition; whereas nothing can be the object of Gods purpose, but some temporall thing or other; and consequently, one purpose of God shall be in time precedaneous to another purpose of God; which is impossible: first, because no purpose of God begins in time: secondly, there is no priority between the purposes of God, but priority of nature and reason; and that onely in such a case as when one is of the end, and the other of the meanes tending to that end; which hath no place in this matter wee now treat of. By the way, when you say, God cannot condemne the creature without sinne, though hee may annihilate him; what doe you meane by condemnation? doe you take it for punishment? If so, then the formality of it, expressed at full, is this; Affliction for sinne. Now

H

consider,

consider, is it a sober speech to say, God cannot afflict for sin, without the presupposall of sin? I doubt not but you deliver your mind; of what God cannot do, in the way of justice: But it is utterly impossible that any man should bee afflicted for sinne without the presupposall of sin: I presume your meaning is only this, (though incommodiously expressed) God cannot excruciate or afflict a creature without the presupposall of sinne. But in whom? I doubt not but your meaning is, in the person afflicted. But what thinke you then of the Sonne of God, how was hee afflicted, and without any presupposall of sinne in him? And I pray you tell mee, hath not God as much power over us as over him? Againe, consider I pray, what power doth God give unto man over inferiour creatures? But let this passe: Can God annihilate us without any respect to sinne, and can hee not afflict us? Alas! what affliction would most men bee content to endure rather then to dye, much more rather then to bee turned to the gulfes of nothing, from whence wee came? If it be said, that God may afflict in some degree, but not in the highest; or for a time, but not for ever; such as wee conceive that torment to bee which wee signifie by the word Condemnation: I pray remember, wee are made after the image of God, and endued with the light of reason, and let us not cast our selves in a brutish manner upon conceits without all evidence of reason. Now tell mee, what reason can bee devised why God should bee able, without all prejudice of his justice, to inflict paine in one degree, in two degrees, in three or foure degrees, in five, six, and seven degrees, without all respect to sinne, onely, if in the eight degree hee should inflict it in this manner, he should bee unjust? Againe, if without injustice hee may inflict paine on an innocent creature for a thousand yeares, or ten thousand yeares, or ten times ten thousand, what reason why hee cannot afflict a creature for ever, without injustice? yet if no finite time can be set which hee cannot exceed, why not for ever? Nay, if a creature should be put to his choyce, whether he would choose to bee annihilated, or to bee in eternall torment, yet preserved without sinne, which of these two would an holy creature make choyce of? should he not preferre his being without sinne (though in eternall torment) before annihilation?

But let us consider the double act of God here devised about the world of mankind severed from the elect: God, you say, did ordain

ordain to judge them according to their workes. I pray consider, who denyeth this? even they that maintaine Reprobation as absolute as Election, doe notwithstanding maintaine, that God doth judge them no otherwise then according to their workes; for they doe not avouch that God doth ordaine to damne them for ought else then for sinne; yea and that for sinne actual, as many as doe dye in actual sin unrepented of; and for originall sinne, as many as doe dye only in originall sinne. Againe, will you deny the same forme of decree to have his course concerning the elect, as well as concerning the Reprobate? Doth not God reward them according to their workes? I meane, as many as live unto ripeness of age; for otherwise it cannot be verified of the Reprobates. And if God doth reward the righteous according to their workes, did hee not also ordaine from everlasting, so to reward them? Neither is Election, rightly stated and in congruous opposition unto Reprobation, any other then Gods decree to reward men with everlasting life for their obedience of faith, repentance, and good works; like as Reprobation is Gods decree to punish them with everlasting death, for their continuance in sinne, without repentance, unto death; albeit, neither of these is Gods complete decree, on either side: but the decree of Election, is, *Præparatio gratiæ & gloriæ*, as *Austin* saith; that is, a decree to give both the grace of obedience, both in the way of faith, repentance, and good works, and to crowne them with everlasting life for it. And so on the other side, *Reprobatio*, as *Aquinas* speaketh, *includit voluntatem permittendi peccatum, & damnationem inferendi pro peccato*: It is the purpose of God both to deny the grace of obedience, as afore-said; or, which is all one, to permit them to persevere in sinne and finall impenitency, and to inflict damnation for their sinne. And unless Election on the one side, and Reprobation on the other, doe include the parts before mentioned, wee shall fall into the *Arminians* definition of Election and Reprobation, who make them meerly conditionate, either in formall terms, or though they avoid the formality of such expressions, yet meerly in effect: as by saying, that, Election is Gods purpose to save them that beleeve and repent; Reprobation Gods purpose to damne them that doe not beleeve and repent: as if there were no other purpose of God, revealed in Gods word, then these; no decree of shewing mercy to whom hee will, by giving faith and repentance; no

decree of hardening whom he will, by denying it. Again, when I say, God doth purpose to reward every man according to his workes, let us understand it aright; for indeede there neither is, nor can bee any such formall decree of God, and of an indefinite nature: as if God in priority of nature or reason did make such a decree, not knowing as yet what would bee the workes of each man in particular: for of such a decree there can be no correspondent execution, distinct from the execution of particular and definite decrees, concerning all men in particular, as I have already shewed in ransacking the absurd order of Gods decrees devised by *Arminians*, to no other end but to catch the simple; there being no common sense nor sobriety in them throughout. Besides this, if when God is conceived to make such a decree God did know particularly the workes of all, then there is no reason to conceive that hee made any such indefinite decree; but rather that the decree to save or damne every one in particular according to his workes, well knowne to him in that very instant, not of duration onely, but of nature and reason. But God did in the same moment foreknow all the particular workes of every man, as already I have made manifest, in ransacking the *Arminian* order of Gods decrees. But the denomination of such an indefinite decree, as to reward every man according to his workes, ariseth from the consideration of other definite decrees in God: As for example, God did decree to have mercy on *Peter*, in giving him faith and repentance, and accordingly to save him; and so of every one of Gods Elect, of ripe yeares: On the contrary, God did decree to deny to *Judas* the grace of faith and repentance; which is as much as to say, that God decreed to permit him to continue finally in sinne, and accordingly to damne him; and so every one of the Reprobates: Whence it followeth, that it is true to affirm, that God decreed to reward every one of ripe yeares according to their workes; not that there ever was any such particular decree conceived by God, distinct from the former, as the *Arminians* feigne; but that from the former particular decrees resulteth the denomination of such a decree as this; as if you should say, If God did decree to save *Peter* and *Paul*, it followeth, that God did decree to save some: not that God did first indefinitely decree to save some, and then decree that *Peter* and *Paul* should be two of them. And to reward men according to their workes, is no more a worke of hatred

*Vindicie gra-
tie Dei. lib. 3.
dig. 2.*

hatted then of love; but as it is indefinite, so it is indifferent to prove in the issue either a worke of hatred or of love; as that God, *Who worketh in us every thing that is pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ*, Heb. 13. 21. shall worke in some that which is pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ, and not in others.

Neither will it follow here-hence, that God rejecteth and reprobateth some upon presupposall of disobedience, more then that hee electeth and predestineth others upon presupposall of their obedience; for undoubtedly God purposed as well to reward the godly according to their workes, as the ungodly according to theirs; though, I confesse, there is a great difference betweene the condition of evill workes and good workes; evill workes being meritorious of punishment, good workes no way meritorious of reward: but this nothing hinders the course of remuneration in generall: And againe, what is wanting of merit on the part of Gods Elect, is abundantly supplied by the merit and satisfaction of Christ. It followeth, I confesse, that upon disobedience on the one side (provided it be finall, not otherwise; for, undoubtedly, abuse both of means of grace in Christ, and other talents and helps of the knowledge of God in nature, is found also in the Elect, though not finall; for, *Novimus*, saith *Austin*, that God hath converted *non modo aversas à vera fide, sed & adversas verae fidei voluntates*) God damneth some for disobedience; and it is no lesse true, that upon obedience on the other side, God saves the others. But this opinion, I confesse, was heretofore shaped by Doctor *Overall*, and perhaps taken from *Caterinus*, but with a little variation, and, if I be not deceived, first devised by the Author of the two bookes, *De vocatione Gentium*; all which notwithstanding are orthodox in the point of Election throughout, excepting *Caterinus*, whose orthodoxy therein is onely in part. But, in few words, I will disprove this latter position of yours, by your owne rules: For thus I dispute, If God did first foresee mans disobedience, and then ordaine them to condemnation, then God did first decree to permit this disobedience, before hee did decree to damne them for it. Whence it followeth, that the permission of this sinne was first in intencion, and consequently, last in execution: that is, God must first damne them, and afterwards permit their disobedience, whereby they deserve damnation. Yet,

Whether sin be the cause onely of Condemnation.

I pray, conceive not hereupon that I maintaine, that God doth first purpose to damne men, and secondly purpose to permit their disobedience; both orders, in my opinion, are very dissolute; though I confesse it is commonly so received, that by denying the one wee must necessarily fall upon the other.

Ans^r.

Herein two things are granted by common consent of our Divines:

1. *That the end of Gods purpose in his positive Reprobation of the world, is to glorifie his justice, power, and wrath in their just overthrow and condemnation.*

2. *That hee doth not purpose to condemne them but for sinne. But two other things you see there bee, wherein, I confesse, I dissent from them; but with submission of my spirit to the guidance of the word, and the spirit of my brethren.*

1. *In the first act of positive Reprobation, that I doe not acknowledge any unwillingnesse at all in God to reward the men of this world with life, upon any condition whatsoever.*

2. *In the second act of positive Reprobation, that I doe conceive the decree of Reprobation to be conversant about the world, not as considered in massa primitus corrupta, as in the first fall of Adam; but as afterwards voluntarily falling from the meanes, either of grace in the second Adam, or of the knowledge of God in nature, by some acts of carelesse or wilfull disobedience.*

Examⁿ.

These two things above mentioned are granted not onely by the common consent of our Divines, but by the common consent also of all Christians, as I conceive, whether Papists or Arminians: yet observe, I pray, as touching the second, that sinne is apparently made the cause onely of condemnation, but not of Gods purpose; whereas hitherto you have carryed the matter so, as if sinne were the cause not onely of condemnation, but also of Reprobation; as much as to say, of Gods purpose to condemne. But to say, that God for sinne did purpose to condemne for sin, is so harsh an expression, that in all my reading I never found any adventure thereupon. Come wee to your proper opinion: You doe not acknowledge any unwillingnesse in God to reward the men of this world with life, upon any condition whatsoever. I know no reason why you should conceive any of our Divines to differ from you in this, although you had spoken out your meaning never so plainly and fully: not onely denying unwillingnesse, but acknowledging

acknowledging a willingnesse, as afterwards you doe; nor a willingnesse onely which may have place though joyned with a will to the contrary, as in all mixt actions, which yet are not incident to God; though they are to a creature, as who sometimes doth some thing *volens nolens*: for certainly, God will save any man upon condition hee beleeves and repents: And on the other side, neither is there any unwillingnesse in God, but a willingnesse rather, yea and that a resolute will to damne any man in case hee dyeth in infidelity and impenitency. For we have the cleare word of God to justifie us herein, professing most evidently, that, *who-soever beleeveth shall be saved; who-soever beleeveth not shall be damned.* So that I wonder not a little whereto these expressions tend, save that commonly, such is the issue of imperfect conceptions, all preparations to the justifying of them fall miserably short of that whereunto they aime.

2. As touching the second act, either you must profess that no Infants perish in originall sinne; or you must, according to your Tenet, consider them onely in *massa primitus corrupta*; for as much as they, dying before they came to the use of reason, were never guilty of any voluntary falling off from the meanes, either of grace in the second *Adam*, or of the knowledge of God in nature, by some acts of carelesse or wilfull disobedience. As for their opinion, who thinke the consideration of all men in *massa Ada* sufficient to justifie God in decreeing the condemnation of all, I take it to be a very rude and undigested conceit; for undoubtedly, if the consideration of sinne be at all prerequisite to the decree of condemnation, it must bee the consideration rather of that sinne for which they are chiefly damned: For, shall the consideration of that sinne onely, which deserves the least degree of damnation, justifie God in the decreeing the greatest degree of condemnation? what colour of justice is found in this? Shall the consideration of telling an officious lye, justifie a Magistrate in decreeing to inflict such a punishment as is due onely to high treason? I say rather, that God considers none in *massa Ada*, before they are in *massa Ada*; for thus to consider, is not *considerare*, but *errare*, or *singere*; which wee cannot decently attribute to God: but God considered all men *tanquam in massa Ada futuros*; and as many as should dye in infancy, God considered them in no other state of sinne, *tanquam futuros*, but in that.

Whether Gods fore-sight of disobedience

that. As for as many as should survive to the use of reason, God considered them, *tanquam futuros*, not onely in *massa Ada*, but guilty of their owne personall transgressions; and whom hee so considered, and withall as finally persevering therein, all them hee decreed to damne. So likewise whom hee considered *tanquam fideles futuros, & respicientiam acturos, & in fide & respicientia perseveraturos*, hee decreed to save. But take heed that herehence you inferre not, Therefore fore-sight of perseverance in sin was the cause or prerequisite of Reprobation; lest you be driven by just proportion to confesse, that fore-sight of faith also and perseverance therein was the cause, or prerequisite at least, of Election. Yet doe not hereupon fall into the contrary extreme, as to thinke that then the decree of Salvation and Damnation precedes the foresight of faith on the one side, or of finall impenitency on the other; though such delusions have had their course, and passed in the world a long time; and all for want of a little Logick, in discerning the right order in intencion of the meanes tending to a certaine end: For, both creation and permission of sinne in *Adam*, and finall perseverance in sinne, and damnation for sinne, are but joynt meanes tending to one end; to wit, the glory of God, in the way of justice vindicative: and consequently the intencion of all those meanes is at once, neither before nor after other, howsoever they are not at once in execution, (which perhaps is the rock of offence whercat many stumble ere they are aware:) As for example, To the curing of a disease a Physician discerneth that many operations are necessarily requisite, these are at once intended, the nature of the disease bespeaking them all; but they are not, nor cannot be executed at once: The like may bee said of all other proceedings, according to the order of *media* and *finis*. So on the other side, creation, permission of sin, deliverance from sinne by the grace of faith and repentance, and finally salvation, are all but joynt meanes tending to one and the same end; to wit, the glory of God in the way of mercy mixt with justice; and consequently, all at once in intencion, though not all at once in execution. But to disprove that which here you affirme, as if some wilfull disobedience, in Gods fore-sight, was before the decree of condemnation, I dispute thus, according to your owne rules; If the fore-sight of disobedience did precede the decree of condemnation, then God did first decree to permit
this

this disobedience, before hee did decree to damne any man for it: which is as much as to say, Mans disobedience was first in Gods intention; and consequently, it must be last in execution: that is, men must first be damned for their disobedience, before God permits them to become disobedient. But let us consider your grounds, in the next place.

That God hath some willingnesse to glorifie his distributive justice, as well as vindicative, in rewarding the world with life upon condition of obedience and repentance, as well as with death upon condition of disobedience and impenitency, appeareth from Gods Oath; As I live (saith the Lord) I have no pleasure in the wicked mans death; but rather that hee should turne from his wickednesse and live. The usuall answer made to this place seems to mee to straine the word beyond his native simplicity. Answ.

1. Some say that God speakes not of all the wicked, but of some of the elect onely, who in time are brought on to repentance: but the truth is, hee speaketh of such wicked men, whereof some dye in their sinnes, as is evident by the parallel place.

2. Others say, that God speaketh of his antecedent will, going before all causes in the creature, not of his consequent will, following the creature in sinne: but plaine it is, hee speaketh of men now wicked, defiled with originall and actnall sin.

3. Others say againe, God speakes not of the secret will of his good pleasure, but of his revealed will: but though I know there be sundry parts of Gods secret will which are not revealed, yet I know no part of his will by oath, doctrine, or historicall narration, that is discrepant from his secret will at all.

Object. If you say, Yes: Gods revealed Will is that all should repent.

Resp. 1. I answer: It is not a part of Gods will revealed by oath, doctrine, or historicall narration; but by a word of command.

2. I say, it is a part of his secret will too; I meane, of his good pleasure, that all men should repent: and it is his displeasure if they repent not.

3. But there is another part of his good will also, that if they repent they shall not perish; and this also revealed in his word: And thus the will of God revealed in a distinct axiome is alwayes consonant to his secret will, and never frustrated.

How Distributive and Vindicative Justice differ.

4. Finally, others say, that God delights not in the death of a sinner, as it is the destruction of the creature, but as it is a means of the manifestation of his justice. I answer, It is true; but the manifestation of his justice stands, as hee expresseth himselfe, in the removall of the cause of their destruction from his owne will to their will; As I live (saith the Lord) I desire not the death of a sinner: Turne yee, turne yee; why will yee dye, O house of Israel?

Examine.

First, here is some Philosophicall error in distinguishing betwene justice distributive and justice vindicative; which are no more to be distinguished than a *genus* is to be distinguished from his *species*: Justice commutative is only opposit to justice distributive; but justice distributive comprehends under it as well justice vindicative as justice remunerative.

2. Here wee have an anxious discourse to prove that which no man denies, as before hath been shewed: And on the other side, it is equally as true, that God hath a willingness to glorifie his vindicative justice, as well as remunerative; to punish with death any one of his Elect, upon condition of finall disobedience and impenitency, as well as to reward with life, upon condition of obedience and repentance.

3. But it appears by the Proöfe, that some further Point is intended then is yet manifested; and such a one as you seeme rather to insinuate then expresse. For whereas hitherto you have proposed a will of God onely conditionate, the place of Scripture alledged mentions no such conditionate will, which is indifferent to passe either upon the life or death of a man accordingly as hee shall be found to repent or not to repent; but rather intimates a will of God inclining to affect rather the life of man then his death: as it is manifested in these words, *I have no pleasure in the wicked mans death; but rather that hee repent and live.* Now this is nothing congruous to a conditionate will; as before premised: First, because a conditionate will, at the best, is but indifferent, to passe either upon life or death according to the condition proposed. Secondly, if the condition of life be such as whereunto man is not so well disposed, and the condition of death such as whereunto man is most prone; it will follow here-hence, that such a conditionate will is more propense to affect a mans death than life. Thirdly, most of all, in case it be such as that the condition of

life

life is never performed, and the condition of death alwayes performed; and the event hereof well knowne to God when hee made this conditionate decree.

4. But whereas you would (I guesse) insinuate, that God doth will the life of the wicked (distinguished from Gods Elect) rather then their death, the place alledged is nothing to this purpose; as not signifying what God doth rather will to come to passe, but what God doth take most pleasure in, when it doth come to passe, whether it doth come to passe or no; for certainly, the life and repentance of the world doth never come to passe, according to your opinion.

5. *Junius* renders the place so, as that Gods delight is signified to be placed in the repentance of a sinner; *Ne vivam si delector morte improbi; sed delector cum revertitur improbus ut vivat.* And indeed God is glorified by our obedience, as whereby hee is acknowledged to be our supreme Lord; not so by our disobedience. And indeed, did God take pleasure in the death of a sinner, what should move him to wait for his repentance, and use all perswasive meanes to bring him to repentance? And it is proposed to take them off from a desperate condition, proposed in these words, *Quia defectioes nostra & peccata nostra incumbunt nobis, ideo ipsi nos tabescimus equi viveremus.* To take them off from this, the Lord sends his Prophet, charging him and saying, *Dic eis, ne vivam ego, dictum Domini, si delector morte improbi, sed cum revertitur improbus a via sua ut vivat. Revertimini, revertimini a viis vestris pessimis; cur enim moreremini, domus Israelis?*

6. Be it spoken in general, both of Elect and Reprobate, (yet onely is it directed to them to whom the Prophets of God are sent;) it followeth not, that God doth will or desire the repentance of any Reprobate; (though to the confirmation hereof you chiefly tend:) certainly, whosoever repents, God takes pleasure in his repentance; and the Scripture saith no more: But that he doth not will it or desire it, out of your owne mouth may be convinced, seeing that God affords not any Reprobate such an effectual grace as hee fore-sees will bring them to repentance; but reserving that for the Elect alone, unto all others hee vouchsafeth onely such a grace as hee knowes full well will never bring any of them unto repentance. And if God would bring any man

Of the severall acceptions of Gods Will.

unto repentance, who should hinder him? shall the will of man? how doth it hinder him in working the repentance of his Elect? cannot hee *omnipotentis facilitate convertere*, (as *Austin* speakes) whom he will, & *ex nolentibus volentes facere*? Againe, doth God continue to will their repentance after they are damned, or no? If no: then is hee changed if ever hee willed their repentance.

7. Certainly, he speaks of men defiled with originall and actual sinne; for hee speaks of such whom he exhorts to repentance: yet this hinders not but that it may proceed of his antecedent will; for nothing but finall impenitency makes way for Gods consequent will concerning damnation.

2 Tim. 1. 10.

8. Saint *Paul*, of all his labours, tendred to the good of all sorts, professeth, that hee suffered them for Gods Elect: How much more in Gods intention was the Ministry of his Prophets for the Elect sake? The question is not so much about Gods delight in the death of the wicked, as about his delight concerning their repentance and life; and this hath no parallel, *Ezech. 18*. applying it to other then Gods Elect.

9. The third Answer, though it seemes to mee not congruous enough in respect of life; because *revealed will*, in this distinction, is usually taken onely for Gods commandement; and life is no precept: yet is it congruous enough in respect of repentance; for it is generally commanded; and consequently, Gods will of life, if it be called his will revealed, may be reduced to congruity, as consequent to repentance, which God commands to all; and consequently, hee may be said, by his revealed will, to will the salvation of all. The Answer to this is nothing to purpose, as sticking upon the termes, *secret* and *revealed*, and not applied to the usual acceptions of this distinction, which is onely to signifie Gods will of commandement, which wee all know to be revealed; and Gods will of purpose, which mostly is not revealed.

10. It is untrue, that it is Gods good pleasure that all should repent; for the will of Gods good pleasure, in the acception of all that ever I read, is onely of that which God will have come to passe; and consequently, of what shall come to passe; not of what should come to passe, to wit, of mans duty; that is generally accounted *voluntas signi*, in distinction from *voluntas beneplaciti*; and in speciall, wee may call it *voluntas precepti*, and distinguish

it from *voluntas propositi*; this is, What God will have to be done; that is, what God will have to be our duty to doe: And thus farre it may be accounted the will of Gods good pleasure (as you call it.) But then, Gods displeasure following hath no congruous opposition hereunto; as when you say, *It is his displeasure if they repent not*: the contrary whereunto is not as you shape it, *It is his good pleasure that all men should repent*; but rather thus, *It is his good pleasure if they doe repent*. That distinction tends to meere confusion. Neither yet doe I like this expression, shaped never so congruously: rather it should runne thus, God is well pleased when men doe repent, and most displeased when they doe not repent; which is most true, but least to the present purpose, as touching the distinction ventilated betweene us, concerning *voluntas signi, & voluntas beneplaciti*.

Your second instance, of *voluntas beneplaciti*, is no lesse extravagant; as when you make the object thereof thus; *If they repent, they shall not perish: If they repent not, they shall perish*: for promises and rewards are but adjuncts to *voluntas signi*, and nothing secret, but plainly revealed. But to whom God will make his commandements, back'd with promises and threats, effectuell to the working of repentance, this is a secret; and this wee commonly account *voluntas beneplaciti*. When you adde, saying, *Thus the will of God revealed in a distinct axiome, is alwayes consonant to his revealed will, and never frustrated*; You continue still in a miserable confusion, worse rather then better: as when you talke of a disjunct axiome, in reference to that which went before, when no disjunct axiome at all went before, but certaine conditionate axiomes; as these, *If they repent, they shall not perish: If they repent not, they shall perish*: whereas disjunct oppositions are such as these; They shall repent or no: They shall perish or no: And to say such axiomes are consonant to Gods secret will, is a wild expression; whereas indeed they are neither consonant nor dissonant, save onely in enuntiating that in an indeterminate manner, which Gods will hath made determinate; and in that respect it is dissonant enough.

Of the cause of the death of a sinner there needeth not to be any question; for undoubtedly, the sinne of man is the cause thereof, in the way of a cause meritorious; but not in the way of a cause naturally efficient. And as undoubted it is, that Gods will is

A Confutation of that Saying,

the cause thereof, as a Judge, in the way of a cause naturally efficient; but not in the way of a cause meritorious. And as cleare it is, that onely the meritorious cause is the chiefe cause in this kind; for as much as by the rendring thereof alone, satisfaction is made to him that demands the reason, why such a one suffereth death. But I wonder what you meane to change the former Translation of the Text, thus, *I have no pleasure in the wicked mans death*, into another, thus, *I will not the death of a sinner*; For, is it not God that inflicteth death? and doth hee not doe all things according to the counsell of his will? *Ephes. 1. 11.* Yet if it were so to be rendred, it will nothing advantage you. And in no other sense can it be said, that hee doth not will it; then in that in which hee is said, not to punish willingly, *Lam. 3.* according to the Latine phrase, when hee doth not punish, *Animi causa*, but by reason of some provocation, the sinne of man urging and moving him thereunto; as is fairely intimated in that, *Hos. 11. 8.* *How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel?* And, *Esay 3.* *They provoke the eyes of his glory.*

Anfw.

For a second ground: In the Covenant of Workes you may see, as in a glasse, what the purpose of God is, in the manifesting his Justice upon the world of mankind; as in the Covenant of Grace you may see, as in a mirrour, what the purpose of God is, in manifesting his mercy upon the Elect: For as it is in men renned after the Image of God; so likewise it is in God himselfe: Such as his Covenant or Promise is, such is his Purpose. God doth covenant and promise in the Covenant of Grace to give life to the Elect, out of his grace in Christ: So here doth God covenant and promise, in the Covenant of Workes, to give life to Adam and all his posterity, if they continue in obedience of his Law; or if, breaking this Law, they return again to him by repentance; as it is described at large, *Gen. 4. 7.* *Levit. 18. 5.* *Ezek. 18. 5. & 20. 11. & 40. 21.* *Gal. 3. 12.* Surely then, the purpose of Gods just retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their obedience, or of their repentance after disobedience. Say not, Surely God purposed nothing but death to the world of mankind (whom hee elected not,) because hee offered them life upon such condition which hee knew was impossible for them to keep: for, first, in Adam they were enabled to keep it; neither impotency in Adam, nor efficacy of Gods decree did put upon Adam any necessity of break-

ing it. Again, in Christ they have so much knowledge and grace revealed to them, and offered, as is sufficient to bring them on to see their impotency in themselves, and to stirre them up to seeke for help, and strength, and life, in him where it is to be found: which if they neglect or despise, as the Pharisees did, and all the rest of impenitent sinners doe, God and his Covenant are blamelesse, in offering them life, and the meanes of it; their destruction is of themselves.

That Proposition of yours, *As it is in men rennewed after the Image of God, so likewise it is in God himselfe*; had need of much limitation and qualification, lest it prove as often false as true, or rather more. That which followes; *Such as is his Covenant or Promise, such is his Purpose*: is likewise as often false as true. If the Promises of God are absolute, such are his Purposes; but if his Promises bee conditionall, such are not his Purposes. Both *Piscator* of late, by evidence of Scripture, and *Bradwardine* long before, by demonstration of Reason, have proved, that no will in God is conditionate, *quoad actum volentis*; all the conditions are found, *quoad res volitas*. And indeed, though the Purposes of God are absolute, yet his Promises are therefore conditionate, because they are conformed to the manner of Gods operation with man: For, as God workes in all things agreeable to their natures; so in man hee useth to worke agreeable to his nature. And therefore, albeit his Purpose bee absolute to bring them to grace and glory, to faith, repentance, and salvation; yet hee allures them to faith and repentance by promises and threatnings. When you say, that, *God doth covenant and promise to give life to the Elect, out of his grace in Christ*: You might as well have said, that, God promisethto give life to them that beleeve and repent; and more congruously a great deale; seeing the conscience of our faith and repentance brings us to the assurance of our Election; the conscience of our Election, or of the assurance thereof, brings us not unto faith and repentance. But it seemes you desire to shape the Promises of God in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Covenant of Workes, in so different a manner, that the one may seeme to bee absolute, the other conditionall; whereas they are of the same nature in both: And as God doth withall intend to give the grace of obedience to the Elect; so doth hee as absolutely intend to deny it to the other. And I wonder you make
not

Examin.

not mention of the Reprobate in the latter; as of the Elect in the former: Undoubtedly, the Covenant of Workes concernes all to whom it is preached; as well the Elect as the Reprobate. And the Covenant of Grace likewise concernes all to whom it is preached; as well the Reprobate as the Elect. To all it is preached, Whosoever beleeveth shall be saved; as well to the Reprobate as to the Elect: To all it is preached indifferently, Whosoever beleeveth not shall bee damned; as well to the Elect as to the Reprobate: onely, God shewes mercy on whom hee will, in giving the grace of faith; and hardens whom he will, in denying it. God doth covenant (you say) to give life to *Adam* and all his posterity, if they continue in obedience to his Law. This then, undoubtedly, concernes the Elect as well as the Reprobate; for they are a part of *Adams* posterity. But I wonder not a little at this language, speaking in the Present Tense, that God doth covenant to give *Adam* life; whereas *Adam* many thousand yeares agoe hath ceased to have any thing to doe with any such Covenant. Therefore this is for some speciall purpose, in joyning *Adam* and his posterity together, as persons covenanted with by God. And I imagine the reason of it to be this: Lest otherwise there could bee no place for continuance in obedience required of all *Adams* posterity; for that presupposeth them to be in the estate of obedience: which was never verified of them all, but as they were in *Adam*, and that in his state of Innocency. But why should wee please our selves with such confusion? Let us consider them apart; and say, that, God did covenant with *Adam* that if hee continued in obedience to his Law; or if breaking his Law hee did returne againe to him by repentance, hee should have life. But what evidence, I pray, have you for this? namely, that God made any such Covenant with *Adam* in the state of Innocency? who ever was found to entertaine any such conceit before you? why might not you as well devise the like Covenant to be made by God with the Angels? Nay, is not the contrary manifest? *In the day thou sinnest thou shalt dye the death.* How could this be verified, if God made any such Covenant with *Adam*? For, if hee were under such a Covenant, hee could not be said to violate it by sinning, but onely by refusing to repent after hee had sinned. And I verily beleve you have no such meaning, as if you conceived any such Covenant to bee made with *Adam* before his fall; and therefore
you

Adams posterity not restored to perfect obedience.

65

you clapt *Adam* and his posterity together; to the end, that if that which you delivered might not hold of the one, it might of the other. And though it hold of *Adams* posterity, as touching this part, of turning unto God by repentance after sinne committed; yet of them it holds not, as touching the other part of the condition, to wit, of continuance in obedience; for the posterity of *Adam*, through his fall, are quite out of the estate of obedience, till God restores them. Nay, God in this life never restores any to the estate of obedience, which was found in *Adam* before his fall. Out of this confusion you inferre, that, Surely the purpose of Gods just retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their obedience, or of their repentance. As before wee were troubled with confusion, so here wee are againe troubled with an unhappy distinction: For, what doe you meane to distinguish Obedience from Repentance, as if Repentance were not Obedience? Dõth not God say as well unto us, *Repent, and believe the Gospel*; as, *If you consent and obey, you shall eat the good things of the land*? Is it fit to distinguish the *Genus* from the *Species*, so as to set one in opposition to the other? Though the contentions of Brethren are as the barrs of a Palace; yet, as Brethren, they are all the Children of the same Father, or Mother, or both. But take wee your meaning; and that by Obedience is to be understood, such a state or condition of obedience as is without all sinne; then let your Position runne plainly thus, *Surely, the purpose of Gods just retribution is to give life to the world of mankind, upon condition of their being without sinne, or of their repentance after obedience*. To this I answer, That, there never was any such Covenant of God with man; I meane, in such sort conditionate: and consequently, there never was any purpose in God to make any such Covenant with man; at least for the time past: As for the times to come, let them speake for themselves, by their owne experience, when they come. But that never any such Covenant had place hitherto, between God and man, it is manifest: For, since the Fall of *Adam* all being borne in sinne, there is no place for such a Covenant, as touching the first part of the condition, which is, of being without sinne. And before the Fall of *Adam* there was no place for this Covenant, as touching the latter part of the condition; as I presume you will not deny: onely the confusion of these two states, before the Fall and after

Esa. 1.

Death not onely intended by God to the Reprobates.

the Fall, hath brought forth this wild conceit of such a Covenant. By that which followeth, it seemes that all these conceptions tend to no worse end, then to justifie Gods disposition towards the Reprobate. And it is great pity that so good an end, as the justifying of God, should bee brought about by no more congruous courtes then these. But I would faine know, what blemish should redound to the nature of God, if hee should intend nothing but death to the world of mankind? yet your selfe will acknowledge, that hee might have intended nothing but annihilation: And is not annihilation as bad as death? But your meaning is, by death to understand sorrow. And is there not just cause to preferre sorrow before death? Yea, but your meaning is, of sorrow in the highest degree, and that everlasting. Why, but if it be no blemish to God to intend nothing but sorrow in seven degrees to the world of mankind, why should it be any blemish to him to intend nothing but sorrow in a degree more? And if it be no blemish to God to intend nothing but sorrow to the world of mankind for millions of yeares, why should it be any blemish to his reputation, to intend to the world of mankind nothing but everlasting sorrow? Yet whom doe you oppose in this? Who ever said, that God did intend nothing but death to the world of mankind? those on whom you obtrude this conceit, doe not affirme this of the world of mankind, but onely of the Reprobates; if they doe affirme any such thing. And why, I pray, should the Reprobates be taken for the world of mankind, rather than the Elect? Neither doth any man say, that God did intend nothing but death to the Reprobates: Hee did intend to them all life as well as death; but withall, that all the posterity of *Adam* should be borne, or at least conceived, in sinne; and also that many thousands should perish in that sinne wherein they were conceived and borne. And I presume you dare not deny this: which yet is the hardest proceeding of God, above all others, except his dealing with his owne Sonne. As for others, he intended to expose them to actuall sinnes of infidelity and impenitency, by denying to them that grace which alone would preserve them from such sinnes; as your selfe spare not to professe: and yet for all this you would obtrude upon us a strange conceit, and that as very reasonable; namely, That God did not intend their death onely, but their life also: whereas God is nothing at all advantaged

Gods decree of damnation absolute.

67

hereby in his reputation, but onely in words, which is no reall reliefe to his honour, but the adding of another injury (if that bee an injury unto him, as you conceive;) namely, to mock him also. And if wee shall nothing pleasure him by a lye, *lying for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him*; surely wee shall doe him no pleasure by thus mocking him. I would you had tried your strength in oppugning their opinion to the uttermost, who maintain God to carry himselfe as absolutely in the way of Reprobation, as in the way of Election: I would gladly have considered it. But let us consider your present discourse: First, you say, *They were in Adam enabled to keep the condition; therefore say not, God intended nothing but death to them.* I pray transferre the case to the Angels; were not they also enabled to keep the condition of life, as well as their fellowes? yet, did not God grant his Elect Angels such a grace as whereby hee knew they would stand; denying such a grace unto the others; and that as absolutely as hee granted it unto the other? And could hee not as absolutely have granted this grace unto them that fell, and denyed it to them that stood? And what would have beene the issue, but quite contrary? & *versis luxisset curia fatis.*

Now let any man, that is not possessed with a prejudicate conceit, consider, whether God did not as absolutely will the damnation of the one, as the salvation of the other; making the one *amplius adjutos* (as *Austin* speaks) then the other? For the absolutenesse of Gods Election of Angels, is seene by the absolutenesse of his giving them such a grace as to keep them from sinne. And if hee doth as absolutely deny others the same grace, as hee must needs; (for before the first sinne of Angels there could bee no cause moving God to deny them grace;) it will follow, that their Reprobation was as absolute as the others Election. Yet what a poore relieving of Gods reputation is this, to say, that *Judas* had power in *Adam* to keep the condition of life proposed to him; though since his Fall hee hath not: yet wee beleewe that *Adam* is saved, who bereaved *Judas* of his ability; and *Judas* damned, for not keeping that whereunto hee had no ability; and that through the Fall of *Adam*. Further, observe I pray you the miserable consequents of this your Argument, as it runnes thus, in few words; *In Adam we were enabled to keep the Condition; Therefore say not, that God intended nothing but death to the Re-*

What the efficacy of Gods decree upon Adam.

probate. By the same reason I may dispute thus : In *Adam* they were enabled to breake the condition of life ; therefore, *Say not that God intended nothing but life to his Elect.* But as hee intended salvation, and not damnation onely, to the Reprobates ; In like sort hee intended damnation, and not salvation onely, to the *Elect* : Especially considering, that not in *Adam* onely, but in themselves also, they are able enough to breake it ; and the best of them have that in them that deserves damnation, nothing that deserves salvation. As for the Reprobates, there neither was nor is any thing in them that fits them for salvation. It is strange that these incongruities should not bee discerned ; ~~or~~ being discerned, men should be so little moved with them. But these are dayes of vengeance ; and when a good man erres, and that in weighty matters, I consider not any judgement of God upon him, but upon the world rather ; that hereby are so much the more countenanced in their erroneous wayes, which are advantageous to flesh and blood ; and therefore they delight in them, and thereby become the more worthy to be given over to illusions, to beleevye lyes. Let mee touch upon that also, as where you say, *It was not the efficacy of Gods decree that did put upon Adam any necessity of breaking it.* This, I confesse, is a plausible speech now adayes, and apt to bee taken up ; especially coming from good mens mouthes, to choake others withall, who feare not to give God the glory of his power, with as much truth, and with a greater distinction and plainnesse ; wee say with *Aquinas*, that, *Gods will is so efficacious, as to cause all things to come to passe after such a manner as they doe come to passe ; to wit, necessary things necessarily, and contingent things contingently, or freely, whether in good or evill.* And if you spare to speake with the Holy Ghost, yet wee will not ; but professe, that, *Both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Israel, were gathered together to doe that which Gods hand and Gods counsell determined before to be done.* And with *Austin*, *Non aliquid fit, nisi Omnipotens fieri velit, vel suando ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo.*

En. lirt. cap.
95.

So that even those things which God *sinis fieri, vult fieri* : Good things he will have come to passe, by his working of them ; evill things hee will have come to passe, by his suffering of them. Nay, otherwise it were impossible hee should foreknow them ; for unlesse they are future, they are not knowable to be future.

But

How Adams fall may be said necessary.

69

But how can it be, that things contingent, and in their owne nature indifferent, as well to be not future as future; how, I say, is it possible that they should passe out of this indifferent condition into a condition determinate; and things meerely possible in their owne nature, become future without a cause? And what cause can be devised of this transition, but the will of God? For, from everlasting, nothing was extant to cause them of things possible to become future, but God himselfe: and in God himselfe, nothing can be imagined to be the cause hereof, but the will of God. This is the insoluble demonstration that cuts the throat of *Scientia media*, whereupon the Jesuites and *Arminians*, and all that oppose the absoluteness of Gods proceedings, doe, and must relye; either wittingly or unwittingly, and whether they will or no; unless they will directly turne Atheists, and with *Cicero* deny that God fore-knowes things that are to come. So that upon supposition of Gods will to permit *Adam* to fall, it was necessary that *Adam* should fall; necessary, I say, that hee should fall: But how? Not necessarily, but contingently, and freely: and no other necessity is at this day found in man for the performing of any particular sinfull act, but such as is joyned with liberty; and that in such sort, as that the necessity is only *Secundum quid*; the liberty is *Simpliciter*: so called, I say, in respect of any particular act. But, I confesse, there is an absolute necessity of sinning, in generall, laid upon man by the Fall of *Adam*; whereby it comes to passe, that whether a man commits a sinfull act, then questionlesse hee sinneth; or whether hee omit a sinfull act, yet therein hee sinneth also; in as much as hee doth not abstaine from it in a gracious manner. I come to the second Reason: Again, you say, *In Christ they have so much knowledge and grace revealed to them, and offered, as is sufficient to bring them on to see their impatency in themselves, and to stirre them up to seeke for help and strength, and life in him, where it is to bee found; which if they neglect and despise, as the Pharisees did, and all impenitent sinners doe, God and his Covenant are blamelesse, in offering them life, and the meanes of it; their destruction is of themselves.* I have read such manner of discourse as this often in *Carvinus*, that busie *Arminian*; I am sorry to read it in the writings of good men; especially when I find it not one jot mended in them. Yet all this I see still tends to a gracious end, even to

Mans destruction is of himselfe.

the justifying of God ; as when you say, *Their destruction is of themselves.* But so doe *Arminians* also pretend ; to wit, the justifying of God in the way of Reprobation : but the issue is, to justifie themselves, and glorifie themselves in the way of Election. But, I pray you, what thinke you of Infants that perish in Originall sinne ; how is their destruction of themselves ? Is it of themselves that they are borne in sinne ? Yet I presume you will not say, with *Arminians*, that all Infants that dye in their infancy, whether they be the Children of *Turkes* and *Saracens*, yet are saved, as well as the children of beleeving Parents. Againe, was not *Pharaohs* destruction of himselfe also, for not letting Israel goe ? yet, will you deny that God hardned his heart, that hee should not let Israel goe ? *Sihon* King of *Heshbon*, was not his destruction of himselfe, in that hee would not suffer Israel to passe by him, though they promised to goe by the high-way, and to turne neither to the right hand nor to the left, and to pay for all that they received of them, both meat and drinke ? neverthelesse it is said, that, *The Lord hardned his spirit, and made his heart obdurate, because hee would deliver him into the hands of the Israelites.* The destruction of *Abimelech* and of the *Shechemites*, was it not of themselves ? yet surely, God it was that sent an evill spirit betweene *Abimelech* and the men of *Shechem*, that the cruelty against the seventy sonnes of *Jerubbaal*, and their blood, might come and be laid upon *Abimelech* their brother, which had slaine them ; and upon the men of *Shechem* which had aided him to kill his brethren. But to proceed : The face of your discourse seemes to tend to the maintenance of a sufficient grace in the Reprobates themselves ; whereof there is much question : but yet you expresse onely a sufficient grace without them, whereof there is no question. For, undoubtedly, in Gods word (whereof even Reprobates are partakers as well as the Elect) there is grace sufficient in the way of instruction and revelation ; no man makes question of this. Undoubtedly, therein is contained all things necessary both for faith and manners, and so to bring them to salvation, if they will obey it. But all the question is, whether they have any sufficiency of grace to enable them to obey it ? I presume your selfe will not avouch this. And the *Pelagians* of old acknowledged a sufficiency of grace in the way of doctrine and instruction. Onely you say, *There is sufficient grace given them to bring them*

them to see their impotency. But how doe you prove this? The naturall man commonly is too preiant of his ability; *Dicere solet humana superbia* (saith *Austin*) *si scissem, fecissem*. What was *Pauls* meaning when hee said of himselfe, *Rom. 7. 9. I once was alive without the Law*? I should think this impotency cannot be discerned without the life of grace. For, like as a dead man naturally is not sensible of his death; so hee that is dead in sinne, is nothing sensible of this his sinfull condition. But howsoever, surely grace revealed onely hath no congruity to such a worke, as to bring a man to see his impotency; for what greater grace in the kind of revelation then the word of God? let this word testifie, that a man is shaped in wickednesse, and in sinne conceived; and that hee is dead in sinne. Is this sufficient to make him see his impotency? Is the hearing of Gods word sufficient to make him beleeve it? why then is it not sufficient to take away mens blindness? and why then doth not every one that hears it, cease to be blind; and consequently, cease to bee lame, and deafe; yea, and cease to be dead also? Nay, which is more, suppose a Physician discovers a man to be in a dangerous estate, when hee dreames of nothing lesse, and suppose the party beleeves it upon his word; yet here-hence it followeth not, that hee seeth the dangerous estate wherein hee is, untill hee hath some feeling of it. So likewise, if hee should beleeve the word, telling him that hee is unable to doe any thing that is good; yet hee shall not be said to see it, till hee hath some feeling of it: and whence can this feeling proceed, but from some principle of life that must be shed into his soule, that hee may have a feeling of that miserable estate wherein hee is by nature; otherwise though upon supposition hee should beleeve it in Gods word, yet hee should not see it in himselfe. Further, you say, *It is sufficient to stirre him up to seek for help, and strength, and life, in him where it is to bee found*. A strange conceit, that a man should seek for life, whereas if hee hath not life hee is dead; and was it ever known that a dead man sought for life? well *Martha* might seeke for the restoring of life to her dead brother *Lazarus*, but surely *Lazarus* himselfe, being dead, neither did, nor could seeke for life. A man that hath life, may be said to labour for life; that is, to hold it, when hee is in danger of losing life: but for a dead man to seeke for life is more then miraculous; for it is utterly impossible. When the Angell came downe into the Pool:

No power in man of himselfe to obtaine life.

Poole of *Bethesda*, the poore Creple had never a whit the more sufficiency to enter in, had his heart beene as lame to desire as his body to goe, notwithstanding that he saw so good an opportunity, hee should make no more halte to desire the benefit, then his body could to enjoy it. Againe, no man seekes for that hee desires nor; neither can hee desire ought, unlesse hee know it, and loves it. And is it possible that a man should know the precious nature of the life of grace, and be in love with it, and yet without the life of grace? Is the knowledge of the precious nature of the state of grace, and the love thereof, a fruit of the flesh thinke you? But, by that which followes, it seemes this is not your meaning; but you suppose, that notwithstanding all the operation of grace mentioned, they may despise it: In which case, they neither love it, nor understand the precious nature of it; for no man despiseth that which hee loves, and accounts precious: Therefore this stirring up seemes to bee nothing but perswasion and exhortation. Now this, as *Austin* long agoe delivered, *Doctrina generalitate comprehenditur*; and we willingly grant, that the word preached doth equally exhort all that heare it, to faith, to repentance, to prayer, in some of which, or in all which, consists the seeking of life. And no man makes question, but the word of God sufficiently performes its part, in exhortation to faith, to repentance, to prayer: but the Pharisees despised this, and so doe most; and God is blamelesse. But of any power that they have to beleeve, repent, and pray, upon the doing whereof they should obtaine life, your selfe are content to say nothing at all; but keep your selfe unto generall phrases, which are very apt to deceive us; and this is the course not onely of them that are in love with their owne errors; but with good men also, when out of a desire to iustifie God, and not content with that simplicity of satisfaction which is laid forth unto us in holy Scripture, and seemes harsh to flesh and blood, making them cry out, *Durus est hic sermo*, they shape unto themselves other courses, more convenient (as they thinke) to give satisfaction; yet not so much unto themselves, as unto others: but all in vaine; for flesh and blood will receive no satisfaction in the plaine truth of God.

Answ.

A third Reason then to prove that God purposed life to the world, upon condition of their obedience and repentance, is taken from the end God aimed at: As hee declares himselfe, to offer
meanes

meanes of salvation unto the world: which is not in the first place to harden, and to leave without excuse; but to bring them to the knowledge of God and of themselves, to repentance, to the seeking after God, to the purging of themselves from sinne, and to peace. To the Gentiles God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts; to reveale the knowledge of God to them, to teach them to doe the things of the Law, to judge of them that doe amisse, and thereby be brought to condemne themselves doing the same things; to lead them to repentance, to move them to seek after the Lord. And thus much light Christ enlighteneth every man withall that cometh into this world. From whence also it was, that God vouchsafed heavenly dreames and visions even to the Gentiles, That hee might withdraw them from their finnes, and hide their pride, and save their soules from the pit. But because this light alone did not prevaile with the Gentiles, as to bring them to the knowledge of God in Christ, therefore it pleased God in the fulnesse of time to send the preaching of the Gospel amongst them; and in the meane time, not to judge them nor condemne them for their not beleeving in Christ, of whom they had not heard; nor for transgressing the Law of workes, which they had not received; but onely for sinning against the law of nature, which was written in their hearts, and expounded to them daily by the workes of Creation and Providence, and sealed up to them by particular amplification, partly by their Consciences accusing or excusing, Rom. 2. 15. partly by dreames and visions, Job 33. 15, 16.

To the Jewes God revealed his Covenant clearly and fully; sent his Prophets among them early and late; gave them deliverances; chastened them with many wholesome afflictions; yea, sent his holy Spirit among them: And all this, in the first place, not to harden, no not carnall Israel; nor to leave them without excuse; but to purge them, to humble them, and to prove them, and to doe them good in the latter end. And when these ends were not attained, hee complaines hee had used these meanes in vaine: which plainly argueth his first and chiefeest intent was to heale, and not to harden. In fulnesse of time God sent his Sonne into the world; not to condemne it, or any thing in it; but that the world might bee saved through him: implying, that even that part of the world which is condemned for refusing of Christ, it was not

Obedience, Repentance, and Faith, conditions of life.

Gods chiefe intent to send Christ to procure their condemnation, but their salvation rather. If they should plead their condemnation to bee unjust, for unbelcefe; because they were not able to beleeve, Ver. 18. our Saviour answers, by a reasonable prevention, Ver. 19. This is their condemnation, viz. the just cause of their condemnation, that when light came into the world, men loved darknesse rather then light: men chose rather to cleave to their sinfull estates and wayes of darknesse, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace; which might have brought them on forward to beleeve in Christ. Again, when Christ lived here in the world, and was the Minister of Circumcision, and so might speake and doe some thing as man; yet as man he went not to doe his owne will, but the will of his Father who sent him: and yet, how willing and earnest was hee to gather Jerusalem under his wings; even his wings in which lay healing and salvation? A signe it was the will of God to have healed and saved that part of Jerusalem which would not. And when our Saviour with tears tells Jerusalem, Oh that thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things that doe belong unto thy peace! doth hee not intimate, that God had even to that day carried thoughts of peace unto them; and accordingly to send them meanes of peace, even those that should never from that day forward enjoy the like means of peace?

Finally, God sent his Spirit into the world, to convince it of sin; because they beleeved not in Christ: Which argueth, that the Spirit did not onely perswade them to beleeve in Christ; but did convince them also that it was their sin, that they did not attaine to beleeve on him. Now, the Spirit of God moveth to nothing, but what hee knoweth to bee according to the will of God: And therefore the Spirit beares witnesse, the will of God is, the world of unbelievers shall not bee shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves through unbelcefe.

Examin.

Still you proceed to prove that which no man denyes: namely, that God purposed life to the world, upon condition of obedience and repentance: provided, that you understand it aright: namely, that obedience and repentance is ordained of God, as a condition of life; not of Gods purpose. Otherwise it were a very wild expresseion to say, that, God ordained that obedience and repentance should be the condition of Gods ordination: Or, that God purposed that obedience and repentance should be the condition of

of Gods purpose. Yet, by the way, I desire to know whether you exclude faith? If you doe, what ground have you to prove that God ever purposed that any of *Adams* posterity, coming to ripeness of age, should be saved upon the condition of obedience and repentance without faith? Last of all, on the other side, it is as undoubtedly true, that God ordained, that whosoever, coming to ripe yeares, should not beleeve and repent, should be damned; the very elect not excepted: Not that any such conditionate decrees are agreeable unto God; but upon such decrees as were absolute in God, such Propositions as these are naturally inferred; Whosoever beleeveeth and repenteth, shall be saved; Whosoever beleeveeth not and repenteth not, shall be damned. One thing I had almost forgotten: In the former Section you spake of a Purpose of God to save the world upon condition of obedience or repentance, in a disjunctive manner: now you are come off from that, and turne your former disjunctive into a copulative, saying, that God purposed to save the world upon condition of their obedience and repentance: This argueth that you are not well grounded in your owne opinion. Howsoever, your third reason is drawn from the end which God aimed at in offering meanes of salvation to the world, which is not (say you) in the first place to harden, or leave them without excuse; but to bring them to the knowledge of God and of themselves, to repentance, to the seeking after God, to the purging of themselves from sinne, and to peace. I am content, first, to consider what you say; secondly, how you prove, who ever said, that God offered meanes of salvation to any to this end, that hee might harden them? Meanes of grace were never (that I know of) called meanes of obduration. Hardening followeth hereupon by accident; but meanes of grace harden not. But when meanes of grace are offered, the corruption of mans heart, uncorrected by the spirit of regeneration, is apt to suggest carnall considerations, such as are apt to make a man obstinately stand out against them. The motion that *Israel* made to *Sihon*, to passe through his Country, hardened him not; but the feare of inconveniencies and dangers, more than enough, upon the passage of so great an Army through his Country, in all likelihood, was it that hardened him; and God is said to harden him, in not correcting that feare, but moving him according to that projecting disposition wherein hee found him. And mark how *Cajetan* commenteth

menteth upon these words, *Utramque hominis partem (spiritum & cor, hoc est, superiorem & inferiorem) male dispositum à Deo, intellige negative penes dona gratuita, positive autem quoad iudicium inclinationem & prosecutionem boni sensibilis. Ita quod Deus spiritum regis durum (hoc est, non cedentem petitionibus) reddidit, & non dando ei gratiam acquiescendi, & cooperando eidem ad affectum securitatis & boni proprii.* When Moses came to Pharaoh, to require him, in the name of the Lord, to let Israel goe; this was not that that hardened him; but his owne pride, superstition, and covetousness: Neither did Gods judgements harden him; for it is divers times signified, that when hee found himselfe eased, then hee hardned his heart: and in other places, in the way of an adversative, when 'tis said, that yet Pharaoh *hardened his heart*; and the like. This also doth remove the cause of hardening his heart from Gods judgements; yet, notwithstanding, it cannot bee denied, but that when God offers the meanes of grace to many, hee doth it with a purpose to harden their hearts; if so be hee entertaines any such purpose at all, as your selfe grants hee doth; for Gods purposes are eternall and immutable. As for your qualification of it, by saying, Hee doth not offer meanes of grace, in the first place, to harden; It is a strange expression, whereof, I am perswaded, you are not able to give any account; but, hand over head, cast out such a phrase as seemes agreeable to your Tenet. For, consider I pray, this first place you speake of, is it in intention, or in execution? It cannot be in intention; for, in intention there is no order in things, but in respect of end and meanes: but, neither obduration is a fit meanes to salvation, nor salvation a fit meanes to obduration. Neither can it be in execution; for, in execution salvation is not found at all, but onely obduration, in the men of the world you speake of. Therefore, your meaning must not be of primacy in place or order, but in principality; as much as to say, Not chiefly to harden, but chiefly to bring to repentance. But none of your Prooves come neare the making of this good, as wee shall see in due place. In the meane time, I disprove it thus; No wise man doth chiefly intend that which hee meanes not to bring to passe at all: Now, God doth purpose to harden them, as your selfe confesse, though not chiefly: but God doth not purpose to save them; for, if hee did, who could hinder him? This is the foule blemish of your opinion; plainly denying

denying Gods omnipotency, as *Austin* long agoe discoursed : and yet you swallow this with facility, though a bit as great as a Camel. I know full well *Arminius* his shifts to ease himselfe of this imputation ; I would gladly bee acquainted with any other mans inventions also. As for the other end, impugned by you, to wit, *to leave them without excuse* ; that, indeed, wee grant may more commodiously be accounted an end intended by God than the former : neither doe you deny it to be intended by God, onely you say, it is not chiefly intended by him ; yet this is such a thing as God brings to passe, to wit, their unexcusablenesse ; but their repentance hee never brings to passe : and is it fit to say, that God chiefly intends that which shall never come to passe, as hee well knowes, rather than that which infallibly shall come to passe, and that by his procurement, as himselfe well knowes ? Thus I have considered what you say : Now I come to consider how well you prove what you have said. *To the Gentiles* (you say) *God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts, to reveale the knowledge of God to them, to teach them to doe the things of the Law, to judge them that doe amisse, and thereby to be brought to condemne themselves doing the same things ; to lead them to repentance, to move them to seek after the Lord.* Like as it were not fit to say, that God giveth us his word to this end, that hee might reveale himselfe unto us, (for so I had rather say, than to say hee reveals the knowledge of himselfe unto us ; because, the very giving of his word is the revealing of himselfe unto us :) In like sort, it is not fit to say, that, *To the Gentiles* God gave the workes of Creation and Providence, and his Law written in their hearts, to reveale himself unto them ; for, like as the word in its kind, so the workes of God in their kind, and the Law written in our hearts, are the revelation of God unto the world : God, in ancient times, teaching the world, *διὰ πρᾶγματων*, as afterwards hee did, *διὰ γραμμάτων*, as *Chrysostome* hath observed long agoe. But suppose all this were granted you, yet is it nothing to purpose ; for here is not the least intimation of any comparison between the objects of Gods intention, to signifie what God did intend in the first place, or chiefly ; and what in the next, or not chiefly. Againe, all this, as touching his not revealing himselfe unto the world, is rather subservient to the end impugned by you, to wit, the leaving them without excuse,

God wills the repentance of all, Voluntate præcepti :

cuse, then opposite therunto ; for, had not God in some sort revealed himselfe unto them, they had not been left without excuse ; neither had there been any place for hardning them to resist Gods truth, if the truth of God had not been some way or other manifested to them. That of aiming to bring them to repentance, and the rest of the same nature, is most for your purpose, if you were able to make it good : But when wee are not wel-grounded in the way that wee take , no marvell if wee multiply expressions, that when some faile us, wee may take hold of other. Sure I am, it is apt to confound the judgement of him that, in the search of truth, shall addresse himselfe to examine it. Now, that God did not at all intend their repentance, I have already proved ; for had hee intended it, it should come to passe, hee would have given it them, seeing it cannot be had without Gods gift, as the Scripture testifies, *2 Tim. 2. 25, 26. Acts 5. 31. & 11. 18.* and as *Austin* long agoe hath expressed it, *contra Julian. lib. 3. cap. 4. Quantum libet præberis patientiam, nisi Deus dederit, quis aget penitentiam ?* But wee are apt to be deceived by phrases of speech, which, carrying many times an ambiguous signification, and being plausible to procure credence one way, is, hand over head, so carried, as if it were nothing lesse true the other way also : As for example, To intend repentance, is a plausible attribute to be given unto God ; but it hath a double signification, the one that hee intends it shall be mans duty to repent ; and in this sense it is not more plausible than true : the other is, that God doth intend they shall repent ; and this is no more true than plausible ; for as much as God intends to give repentance to none but to his Elect : like as, *de facto*, hee brings none to repentance but his Elect, according to that of *Austin, contra Jul. Pelag. lib. 5. cap. 4. Istorum neminem* (saith hee, speaking of the Reprobate) *adducit ad salubrem spiritualemque penitentiam, quæ homo reconciliatur Deo in Christo, sive illis ampliore patientiam, sive non imparem præbeat.* As for that of Gods leading to repentance, *Rom. 2. 4.* I answer, first, I had thought that had been delivered rather of the Jewes than of the Gentiles ; and *Acts 17. 30.* the Apostle doth clearly signifie, that the admonition of Gentiles to come to repentance, was reserved for the time of the Gospel ; *The time of this ignorance God regarded not, but now hee admonisheth all men every where to repent.* And in reason, faith and repentance
are

are inseparable ; and therefore, where there was no admonition unto faith, how could there be admonition unto repentance ? And who would not rather incline to think, that the Gentiles (taking them in separation from the Church of God) had the knowledge of God and of his Law given them, not to bring them to repentance that they might be saved, (for I acknowledge no sufficiency of instruction granted them hereunto) but rather for the ordering of their lives in morall conversation, and for the politique government of the world, lest otherwise all things should run to disorder and confusion ? And, as *Austin* saith, that the meanes of grace are granted to some, *ut proficiant* thereby, *ad exteriorem vite emendationem, quo melius puniantur*.

Secondly, Gods leading to repentance, in that place, is attributed to the goodnesse of God, which is shewed in his patience and long-suffering ; as if it signified no more than giving way unto repentance.

Thirdly, take it as rigorously as you will, it cannot signifie more than God performes by his word, and preaching of the Gospel : For, can you imagine that God performes more by his workes in leading men unto repentance, than by his word ? Now, Gods leading to repentance by his word, is but his admonishing them to repent ; *Acts 17.30. Now he admonisheth all men every where to repent*. And here-hence it followes not, that God doth will their repentance any otherwise then *voluntate precepti*, not *voluntate propositi*, or *bene-placiti* ; for if hee did, then must hee needs give them the grace of repentance. Yet, I confesse, in this *voluntas precepti* is included *voluntas propositi*, in some sense ; which yet nothing serves your turne, though some equivocation makes it seeme plausible, taking it hand over head in the generall ; for it signifies withall, that it is the will of Gods good pleasure that they ought to repent, and it is their duty to repent : But there is much difference between these two Propositions, Its my good pleasure that it shall be your duty to repent ; and, It is my good pleasure that you shall repent ; and therefore I will give you the grace of repentance. As for the second place of importance, drawn out of *Job 33. vers. 15, 16, 17.* of Gods providence in vouchsafing heavenly dreames and visions unto the Gentiles, that hee might withdraw them from their sinnes, and hide their pride, and save their soules from the pit : This likewise, in two respects, is nothing.

thing for the purpose: For, first, this is spoken of such a time as wherein there was no partition-wall, as afterwards was erected, between the Jewes and Gentiles; and therefore you doe not well to apply this unto the Gentiles, in distinction from the Church of God: for, was not *Job*, and such like, in those dayes, of the Church of God? doth not God send his friends unto him, that hee might sacrifice for them, God himselfe promising to accept it? Secondly, you are to prove, that God doth intend the repentance of those in whom hee doth not effect repentance: But *Elihu*, in *Job*, speaks of God intending the repentance in those in whom hee doth effect repentance; as it appears, Vers. 16, & 23, 24, 25. and yet I deny not but God may intend a kind of repentance even in the wicked; to wit, *exteriorem vite emendationem*, as *Austin* speaks; and so deliver them from judgement temporall, and make also their damnation more tolerable. Here you passe over from Gods naturall providence to a more gracious providence, but not with a right foot; as when you say, that *because this light alone did not so farre prevaile with the Gentiles, as to bring them to the knowledge of God in Christ; Therefore it pleased God, in the fulnesse of time, to send the preaching of the Gospel amongst them*: You should have said rather, Because this light alone could not prevaile: but so, perhaps, you had much prejudiced your owne Tenet. I say, you should have rather said so; seeing you undertake to give the cause of this interchange of the providence of God: For, to say onely, It did not prevaile; is not to alledge any tolerable cause thereof; especially, considering that you make the blame hereof wholly to lie upon mans wilfulness: for by the same reason you might introduce a further course of Gods more gracious providence to bring men unto repentance, than any hee hath undertaken yet; for even the preaching of the Gospel, thereby admonishing men to repent, doth not prevaile with most. There is another incongruity, as when you say, *This light of nature alone did not prevaile*; as if you would imply, that the light of grace alone doth prevaile: which, I presume, you will confesse, is notoriously untrue; and that not onely illumination of the mind, but the affection of the heart by the finger of God is necessarily required to bring men unto repentance. As for that which followeth therein, I doe most willingly and freely concurre with you, acknowledging that God condemnes none
for

for not beleeving in Christ, of whom they had not heard; nor for transgressing the Law of *Moses*, which they had not received; but onely for sinning against the Law of nature, which was written in their hearts: For I verily beleve, that where there is no Law, there is no transgression. But, I presume, you deliver this onely in reference to men of ripe yeares, and doe not concurre with *Arminians*, in maintaining that all infants dying in their infancy are saved. Thus, from Gods providence concerning the Gentiles, I come unto his providence concerning the Jewes.

2. Of the sufficiency of outward meanes of grace granted unto the Jewes, to bring them unto repentance, no man makes question: yet seeing that among them, all were not precious, but many were found vile enough, and reprobate silver, according to that, *Rom. 9. 6. All are not Israel which are of Israel*; and that of the Prophet, *Esay 10. 22. Though the number of the children of Israel were as the sand of the sea, yet but a remnant shall be saved*: and how few were those represented by the basket of good figs, *Jer. 24. 2. in comparison to those other naughty figs, which could not be eaten they were so evill*? That God did intend the salvation and repentance of those to whom hee never gave repentance and salvation, I hold it as impossible for you or any man to prove, as to pull God down from the throne of his omnipotency, or disrobe him of his immutable perfection: For, unlesse God continues to intend their repentance and salvation, even when they are damned, hee must be mutable; and if hee did will and desire their salvation, the reason why they failed of salvation must needs be, because God was not able to procure it. I never met yet with any other then vile shifts, to avoyd these consequences, both in *Arminius*, and others that follow him. But consider wee your proofes: nay, what proofe doe you bring to prove the point you undertake, namely, that God doth not onely intend their repentance, but that in the first place; and yet you cannot deny but that this, which you say God intends in the first place, never comes to passe: whereas the other, which God intends (you confesse) though in a latter place, doth come to passe. But because I think it were absurd to conceive, that God intends their repentance whom hee purposeth to harden, lest they should convert, and God should heale them; therefore I am willing to consider what you bring to the contrary. Your first place is out of *Deut. 8. 16. Who*

God intends not the Repentance of those

fed thee in the wildernesse with manna, which thy fathers knew not, to humble thee, and to prove thee, and that hee might doe thee good in thy latter end. That of humbling thee, Junius and Piscator reads thus, *ut affligeret te*; belike, partly in reference to that which followeth, *and to prove thee*; (for as much as temporall humiliation hath more congruity to the proving of them, than spirituall; as where-by they humble themselves, and which followeth the proving of them, rather than goeth before it;) partly in reference to the third Verse, going before, where it is said more at full, *Therefore hee humbled thee, and made thee hungry, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know it; that he might teach thee, that man liveth not by bread onely.* By which words wee may gather a faire interpretation of that you alledge: If it be spoken of humiliation spirituall, thus, *Hee fed thee with manna to humble thee*; that is, to teach thee to humble thy selfe: and so indeed his providence, providing alike to them all, did equally teach them all to humble themselves. But did God intend that every one should, *de facto*, humble himselfe? why then did hee not give them eyes to see, and eares to heare, and an heart to perceive, as Deut. 29. 4. *Moses* tells them plainly, saying, *Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and eares to heare, unto this day.* I deny not but God did manifest, by the course of his providence towards them, what hee did require and deserve at their hands, namely, that they should humble themselves to walke with the Lord their God; and the phrase, *to humble thee*, applyed even to the most carnall, may have a faire construction, *that thou shouldst be humbled*, or, *humble thy selfe*, understanding it *ex officio*; for hereby hee did manifest that this was their duty, answerable to Gods proceedings with them: and yet further, considering that hee representeth his owne gracious proceedings with them, by the proceedings of an earthly father with his children, Verse 5. *Know therefore in thine heart, that as a man nurtureth his sonne, so the Lord thy God nurtureth thee*; no marvell if he expresseth his affections and desires towards them, suteable to the desires and affections of an earthly father, who being not able effectually to procure their amendment, yet desires it. And this is Gods usuall course, to expresse himselfe in such language, *per analogiam*. But, shall wee hereupon take liberty to build doctrines, as touch-

ing

ing the nature of God, as if that which is figuratively uttered were properly delivered? Hee proved them all, I confesse, and upon the probation some proved good silver, and others no better than drosse; and thereupon hee did good to the one in their latter end, and not unto the other: Neither did hee ever purpose, that good in their latter end should redound unto any, but as they should be humbled: wherein, humiliation is made the condition of doing them good, not of Gods purpose or intention: And withall, God gave unto those that were truly mortified, *that is, truly humbled, hearts to perceive, eyes to see, and eares to heare*; but hee gave not the like grace unto all. And looke what is said of Gods intention to humble them, the same may be said of Gods intention to purge them, according to that *Ezek. 24. 13. Because I would have purged thee, and thou wast not purged, thou shalt not bee purged from thy filthinesse, till I have caused my wrath to light upon thee*: I would have purged thee, *voluntate precepti*, represented by the meanes used in his word; which failing, hee resolveth to take another course, even by judgements in his works, meaning to goe on in avenging the quarrell of his Covenant, *Levit. 26. 25. untill their uncircumcised hearts were humbled, Levit. 26. 41.* purposing so at length to effect it; as hee professeth, *Ezek. 22. 15. saying, I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the countries, and will cause thy filthinesse to cease from thee.* Yet this is not so much by the power of afflictions, as by the power of his Spirit, *Esay 57. 17. For his wicked covetousnesse I was angry with him, and have smitten him: I bid me, and was angry; yet hee went away and turned after the way of his heart: I have seen his wayes, and I will heal them.* But, when these ends are not attained, God complaines (you say) *He had used these meanes in vaine.* Indeed, *Jer. 2. 20.* hee saith, *Of old have I broken thy yoke, and burst thy bonds, and thou saidst, I will no more transgresse; but, like an harlot, thou runnest on all high hills, and under every green tree.* But this is rather a conviction of their unfaithfulnesse, in not keeping Covenant with him, than a complaint: But be it a complaint, as such complaints are attributed unto God, like as men complaine when they cannot help; but take heed wee doe not here-hence inferre, that God is like man, not able to prevent crosse events contrary to his expectation. Neither doth hee there say, *Hee had used those*

Gods corrections should lead to Repentance.

meanes in vaine; for, before hee used them, he knew at least (you will not deny it) what would be the issue; and no wise man, I think, will let himselfe to doe that which hee knowes will prove vaine, in respect of the end intended by him. But *Jer. 10. 30.* the Lord saith thus, *I have smitten your children in vaine, they have received no correction*; and this plainly argueth (as you say) his first and chiefest intent was to heale, and not to harden. It is true, upon a superficiall scanning of the place, it seemeth that God intended to heale them; but of any comparison made between two ends intended, the one chiefly, the other secondarily, not the least glympse of evidence. But I deny that hee intended healing at all in this case; for, if hee did, that being his owne worke, why did hee not heale them? Will you say, Because they would not receive instruction, but went after the way of their own hearts still? This is a vaine answer; for this is no impediment unto God; as I prove first by cleare evidence of Scripture, *Esay 57. 17.* *I have smitten him, and yet hee went after the way of his heart*; nevertheless mark what follows, *I have seen his wayes, and I will heal them.* Secondly, by cleare demonstration of reason; to heale them, is to bring them to repentance: Now, will you say that God is ready to performe this, provided that they doe repent? If they repent already, what need is there of Gods grace to bring them to repentance? and what is it to prerequisite repentance on mans part, to this end that God may give them repentance? as if man must first repent, and then God will give him repentance. But some will say, What then is the meaning of the Lord, saying, *I have smitten your children in vaine, they have received no correction*? I answer, we are to conceive Gods corrections to tend to this, according to that of *Peter, knowing that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation*: or, God speaks this, *ἐλεησεν ὁ θεός*, after the manner of earthly parents, seeking their childrens amendment by correction, but not obtaining it. And this being an end of correction in Gods children; in the wicked this end is not obtained. And what difference is there between meanes naturall and meanes morall, but this, meanes naturall have power to effect their ends, meanes morall are to admonish morall agents of their duty to doe this or that? and so the ends of Gods punishment is, that by them wee should learne to amend our lives; as is signified in the Collects of our Church. In a word, naturall means tend

to ends that shall be thereupon; morall means tend to ends that should be; and each are usually said to be in vaine, when the end, according to each kind, is not obtained. God sent his Sonne into the world, not that hee should condemne the world, but that the world should be saved by him. Most true; for hee sent his Son into the world, to dye for the world; and to dye for them is to save them, and not to condemne them. But, for whom did hee send his Sonne into the world, to dye? Surely, for the world of Elect; even for those whom God the Father had given him: *Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that hee should give eternall life to all them that thou hast given him, Joh. 17. 2.* And if wee consider the world, in distinction from those whom God hath given him, hee plainly professeth, that as hee did not pray for them, Joh. 17. 9. so hee did not *sanctifie himselfe for them, Verse 19.* that is, offer himselfe up upon the Crosse; as *Maldonate* acknowledgeth to be the joynt interpretation of all the Fathers whom hee had read: And your selfe have but earst confessed, that *God did not (Joh. 3.17.) give the world unto Christ, by him of grace to be bought (or brought) unto salvation.* Undoubtedly, hee sent not Christ into the world at all to procure any mans condemnation: neither doth Christ procure any mans condemnation; although infidelity and disobedience to the word of Christ procures the condemnation of many. And I wonder what moved you so to speake, as to imply it was Gods intent (though not chiefe intent) to send Christ into the world to procure the condemnation of any. At length we are come to the *crux* of the point controverted between us, in the words following; *If they should plead their condemnation to be unjust, for unbelieve, because they were not able to beleve,* Ver. 18. our Saviour answers by a reasonable prevention, *ver. 19. This is their condemnation, viz. the just cause of their condemnation, that when light came into the world, men loved darknesse rather than light; men chose rather to cleave to their sinfull estates, and wayes of darknesse, than to follow the light of the means of grace, which might have brought them on to beleve in Christ.* First, let us consider the Text it selfe, then your interpretation and accommodation thereof. Our Saviour doth plainly derive the cause of their unbelieve, or disapprobation of the Gospel, signified in these words, *They loved darknesse rather than light; I say, the*

cause of this our Saviour referres to their workes of darknesse, expressed in these words, *Because their deeds were evill.* The full meaning whereof, I take to be this; The workes wherein they delight are evill; that is, workes of darknesse; and therefore no marvell if they hate the light, and preferre darknesse before it: — *Pulchra Laverna, Da mihi fallere, da justum sanctumq; videri.*

Noctem peccatis, & fraudibus objice nubem.

But give mee leave to make an honest motion: As it becomes us to take notice of this cause mentioned here, so it becomes us nothing lesse to take notice of other causes mentioned in other places. Now, another cause of unbeliefe is mentioned *Joh. 5. 44.* and that of the same generall nature with this, but expressed in more speciall manner by our Saviour, thus, *How can yee beleve, which receive honour one of another, and seeke not the honour that cometh from God onely?* Yet this is not all the cause of unbeliefe which the Scripture commends unto us; for the Apostle also takes notice of Sathans illusions, in this worke of unbeliefe, *2 Cor. 4. 3, 4.* *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: Whose eyes the God of this world hath blinded, &c.* And because it is in the power of God to correct this delight wee take in evill workes, and to deliver us from the illusions of Sathan, if it please him to shew such mercy towards us; and when he doth not, he is said to harden us; The hand of God in this our Saviour takes notice of, as the cause of unbeliefe in man, *Joh. 12. 39, 40.* *Therefore they could not beleve, because Elias saith againe, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heale them.* Like as *Moses* of old told the Jewes, saying, *Deut. 29. 2, 3.* *Yee have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt unto Pharaoh, and unto all his servants, and unto all his land: The great temptations which thine eyes have seen, the signes, and those great miracles: Ver. 4.* *Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and eares to heare, unto this day.* And this hee doth even then when his purpose was to reprove them for their naturall incorrigiblenesse; for men sinne never the lesse obstinately, because God denies them grace, but rather so much the more obstinately; because (as *Austin* well saith) *Libertas sine gratia non est libertas, sed contumacia*: and, consequently, they are never a whit the lesse faulty, though

though it be not in their power to correct that corruption of their hearts, whence this faultinesse proceeds. And hereupon the Apostle gives way to the same objection, in effect, which you propose; for, having concluded that *God hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardeneth*, hee gives place to such an objection; *Thou wilt say then, Why doth hee yet complaine? for who hath resisted his will?* and answers it not as our Saviour doth; for our Saviour proposed no such objection to be answered, as you feigne the Apostle doth plainly, and in expresse termes. Our Saviour discovers the immediate cause of unbeliefe, to wit, because *their hearts were set on evill*; as it was sometimes with the *Colossians*, *Col. 1. 21.* yet because it was not in their power to change their hearts, but God alone; who will change them, through mercy, in whom hee will; and will not change them in others, but harden them. Hereupon the Apostle gives way to an objection, in a matter more sublime than yours, as before mentioned, and answers it in this manner, *O man, who art thou that disputest with God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made mee thus? Hath not the Potter power, &c.* which is an answer to such a question as this, Why doth God complaine of us for that which proceeds from the hardnesse of our hearts, which God alone can cure, but will not; but rather, by denying us mercy, continues to harden us?

But now, let us consider the interpretation and accommodation of this place, to the plea devised by you: The reason, you say, why *men loved darknesse rather than light*, is, *because men chose rather to cleave to their sinfull estates, and wayes of darknesse, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace, which might have brought them on to beleeve in Christ.* It is great pity that by our owne phrasiologies wee should raise unto our selves a mist, whereby wee should be the more unable to discern the truth of God. Suppose the Paraphrase were both found in it selfe, and congruous to the Text; yet give way, I pray, to such a question in the second place, What was the reason that they chose rather to cleave to their sinfull estates, and wayes of darknesse, than to follow the light of the meanes of grace? If you answer any thing but that of our Saviour, *Joh. 12. 39. Therefore they could not beleeve, because Esaias saith againe, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand*

Evill Consciences avoid the light.

stand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them; I will not cease to pursue you, untill you come to this; and withall, put you to give a reason, why you should not take hold of this answer of our Saviour Joh. 12. 39. as of that Joh. 3. 19. especially, considering that if a question were moved, Why some chose rather to follow the light of the meanes of grace, than to cleave to their sinfull estates, and wayes of darknesse? I doubt not but you would forthwith answer, Because God had mercy on them, and gave them hearts to know Christ, and to beleieve in him, 1 Joh. 5. 20. Phil. 1. 29. And seeing God doth not shew the like favour to others, to shew them the like mercy, which is, in Scripture phrase, to harden, Rom. 9. 18. and Rom. 11. 7. or, not to give hearts to perceive, and eyes to see, and eares to heare, Deut. 29. 4. why should wee not say plainly, that whereas the one takes a right way, it is because God shewes mercy towards them, to give them to much grace; and whereas the other takes not the right, but the wrong way, it is because God hardens them, in denying the like mercy and grace to them? like as our Saviour exprefly signifieth also, Joh. 8. 47. Hee that is of God heareth Gods words; yee therefore heare them not, because yee are not of God. But if any man shall inquire, What then moved our Saviour to give this reason why men loved darknesse rather than light, to wit, this, because their deeds were evill? I answer, hee gives the immediate cause why they loved not the light; that is, they had no mind to heare the doctrine of our Saviour: and that was, in respect of the convincing nature of it, and therein, like unto light, which makes every thing to appeare and be manifest, according to its proper hiew; whereas in darknesse all things are confounded; according to that Ephes. 5. 13.

Now they who brought ill consciences along with them, no marvell if they were quickly weary of our Saviours company: A pregnant-example whereof wee have Joh. 8. 7. For when our Saviour said unto them who brought unto him a woman taken in adultery, *Let him that is among you without sinne cast the first stone at her.* Ver. 9. *When they heard this, being accused by their owne conscience, they went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even to the last.* So that, indeed, the reason given by our Saviour Joh. 3. 19. is not so much a reason why they beleieved not, as why they liked not to heare him. Many did endure the hearing of him,
yet

yet were not brought to beleve in him. *Austin* sometimes proposed such a question as this; Why doe not men doe this or that? As for example, Why doe they not *facere quod justum est*? and hee answers, *Quia nolunt*. But if you aske mee, *Quare nolunt*? *Imus in longum*, saith *Austin*. Yet, *sine prejudicio diligentioris inquisitionis*, hee takes upon him to answer it thus, *Vel quia latet, vel quia non delectat*. But marke what hee brings in upon the back of this; *Sed ut innotescat quod latebat, & suave fiat quod minime delectabat, gratia Dei est quæ hominum adjuvat voluntates*. But the face of your discourse tends to this, as if you were of opinion, that every naturall man hath so sufficient grace, as to choole to follow the light of the meanes of grace, rather than to cleave to his sinfull estate, and wayes of darknesse: and that not onely if hee will, for if hee will, the greatest part of the worke is done already; but that his will is indifferently of it self inclinable to the one as well as to the other: which is so dangerous an opinion, and so opposite to the doctrine of Gods word, representing the miserable corruption of mans heart, and the peculiar power of Gods regenerating grace, that you are loath to breake out in plaine termes to profess as much. Lastly, whereas you say, *The light of the meanes of grace, had it been followed; might have brought them to beleve in Christ*; You will not say, upon the following hereof they had been brought, but they might have beene brought to beleve. By following the light of the meanes of grace, I understand a continuing to heare the word of God: Now, it is well knowne that many, nay most, in all probability, though they continue all their dayes to be hearers; yet, as the Apostle speakes of some, so may wee say of them, *They are ever learning, and never come to the knowledge*, at least to any saving knowledge, of the truth. On the contrary, *Saul* persecuting the Church of God, even in the way, marching furiously, *Je-hu* like, against the Professors of the Gospel, it pleased God to call him, and convert him. Wee know, saith *Austin*, that God hath converted the wills of men, not onely *aversas à vera fide, sed & adversas vera fidei*. So that even opposition to grace God can cure, if it please him; and regenerate a man to bring him to faith and repentance, if it please him; and if hee doth not, certainly the reasons can be no other, then because hee will not; and that to his owne glorious ends, which is reason enough for the

What meant by Gods thoughts of Peace.

Creator to doe what hee will; his wisdom in referring all to congruous ends, being his justice; as *Aquinas* acknowledgeth. Christ was willing and earnest to gather Jerusalem under his wings; and no marvell, hee was bound to doe all hee could, as the Minister of Circumcision, to save his brethren; for hee was made under the Law, and was bound to love not onely his brethren, but his enemies also, as well as wee are bound to shew the like love to all: But to inferre here-hence, that therefore it was the will of God to have healed and saved that part of *Jerusalem* that would not, is a liberty which affection to a cause may take, but no reason doth justifie it. Like as our Saviour in his ministry, so the Prophets in theirs, desired to doe as much good as they could to all: but here-hence it followeth not, that it was the will of God to convert all whom the Prophets desired to convert. And as our Saviour by his teares, so the Prophets by their teares, did manifest their desire to bring them to repentance, to doe the uttermost of their power to bring them hereunto: but will you inferre here-hence, that God also did desire to bring them to repentance? As for the phrase of *carrying thoughts of peace towards them*, that is generall, and therefore ambiguous; and to what specialty you doe referre it, I know not: Yet, according to the Scripture sense thereof, it is nothing correspondent to your opinion. For Gods thoughts of peace, in Scripture phrase, towards his people, consist not onely in affording meanes, but in making them effectuell also to the procuring of such a gracious disposition in his people, as to make them fit for the mercies which God hath resolved to conferre upon them; as *Jer. 29. 10.* *But thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babel, I will visit you, and performe my good promise towards you, and cause you to returne to this place.* Verse 11. *For I know the thoughts that I have thought towards you, saith the Lord, even the thoughts of peace, and not of trouble, to give you an end, and your hope.* Verse 12. *Then shall yee cry unto mee, and yee shall goe and pray unto me, and I will heare you.* Ver. 13. *And yee shall seek me, and find me, because yee shall seek me with all your heart.* Ver. 14. *And I will be found of you, saith the Lord, and I will turne your captivity.* And as for the former phrase, in saying, *It was the will of God to have healed them*: In proportion to the place now alledged out of *Jeremy*, it may be granted

Jer. 13. 17.

granted, that God would have healed them; to wit, in case they would have converted unto God with all their heart, and with all their soule; as our Saviour signifies, *Joh. 12. 40.* and that out of *Esay 6.* and like as God himselfe expressly professeth, *Deut. 4. 29.* *If from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thine heart, and with all thy soule.* But is it, thinke you, in any unregenerate mans power to seek God with all their heart, and with all their soule? I thinke this is no more in the power of a man unregenerate, than it is in his power to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soule: Now this is expressly attributed to the circumcision of the heart wrought by God, *Deut. 30. 6.* When you adde, that the will of God is, the world of unbelievers shall not be shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves through unbeliefe: This assertion of yours is such as no man, that I know, denies: And it is as true of the Elect as of the Reprobate; namely, that they should be utterly shut out of Christ, if they should shut out themselves by small unbeliefe; for, undoubtedly, the word of God is true, that faith, *Whosoever beleeveeth, shall be saved; whosoever beleeveeth not, shall be damned.* But lest we should seeme to be pleased with our owne errors, let us speake distinctly, and keep our selves from confusion: To be shut out of Christ, is, to be shut off from some benefit that is to be obtained by Christ. Now, if wee speake of the benefit of forgiveness of sinnes, and of salvation; the truth is plaine and distinct, that no man is bereaved of salvation and forgiveness of sinnes by Christ, but through unbeliefe; and whosoever beleeveeth not, is excluded from pardon and salvation by Christ. But is there no other benefit wee obtaine by Christ, besides forgiveness of sinnes and salvation? What thinke you of the gift of faith and repentance? are not those spirituall blessings which wee obtaine in Christ, and for Christs sake? *Ephes. 1. 3.* If it be so, I pray consider, Is it handsome to say, that none is shut off from the gift of faith, but through unbeliefe? Certainly, unbeliefe is no tolerable cause why God should deny them the gift of faith, seeing all are in unbeliefe till God bestowes upon them the gift of faith; neither can it be expected a man should beleeve, till God gives him the gift of faith, if so be faith be indeed the gift of God, and not the work of mans free-will without any gift of God. As for your discourse, though

God wills the worlds conviction of sin.

it tends to a conclusion, which, rightly understood, no man denyeth in one sense ; nor will any wise man affirme in another sense : I thinke fit to consider that also. *The Spirit*, you say, *convinceth the world of sinne, because they beleevd not in Christ ; but the Spirit of God moveth to nothing, but what hee knoweth to be according to the will of God.* Let all this be granted ; yet nothing followeth here-hence but that it was the will of God that the world should be convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ ; which no intelligent man will deny. But yet, by your leave, it is no good consequence to inferre here-hence, that, therefore it is the will of God that the world of unbelievers shall not be shut out from Christ, if they shut not out themselves by unbeliefe. Therefore, we grant both the antecedent and the consequent : yet, by the way, as touching that which you affirme, that *God sent his Spirit to convince the world of sinne, because they beleeve not in Christ* ; this is a truth, wee confesse ; but, perhaps, wee may be to seeke of the right accommodation hereof : for, where is the world convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ ? or, to whom ? I grant, to all beleevers the world of unbelievers is by the Spirit of God convinced of sinne, in not beleeving in Christ ; but are they convinced hereof to themselves, and in their owne consciences ? I grant this also, as often as it pleaseth God to convert them by the power of his Spirit ; then they are convicted of the sinfull nature of their owne unbeliefe : Yet be it granted, that an unbeliever continuing in unbeliefe may be, and is, sometimes convicted of the sinfull nature of his unbeliefe ; because the Apostle saith of an heretique, that hee is *ἀνοργάνιστος* : yet, that is not till after one and another admonition : neverthelesse, this makes nothing for you, unlesse you maintain that Gods Spirit convicts them also of this, that it is in their power to beleeve ; which power of beleeving you seeme to attribute to a man unregenerate, though you are loath to speake plainly, in expressing so much. And you seem to intimate such an Argument as this ; *They sinne in not beleeving ; therefore it is in their power to beleeve* : But you may as well inferre, that wee sinne in not keeping Gods Law ; therefore it is in our power to keep it. Or, if you dispute thus, The world is convicted of sinne in not beleeving ; therefore they have power to beleeve : You may as well dispute thus ; The regenerate are convicted that they sinne, in that their flesh lusteth against

Of the harmony between Gods Purpose and Covenant.

93

against the Spirit ; therefore it is in their power to keep the flesh from lusting against the Spirit.

Besides, when men quench the motions of the Spirit, and persecute the Ministers of the word, how can they be said, in so doing, to resist the Holy Ghost, if the Holy Ghost went not about such a worke, as to bring them to Christ, and to life by him? Could they be said to resist the Holy Ghost, if the workes of the Holy Ghost had never striven with them to worke this worke in them? Thus then you see, those three that beare witnesse in heaven, the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, they all from heaven beare witnesse of this point in hand, concerning the truth hereof: The Father, by the end of the creation of his workes and providence; the Sonne, by his end of enlightening the world, and of his coming into it to dye for it; the Holy Ghost, by his inward wrestling in the hearts of men, doe all of them really proclaime, that it is the will and good pleasure of God, as to save the Eleēt, not according to their owne workes, but his grace; so likewise to save the world of mankind, if their workes hinder not his good will towards them. Thus you see also a sweet harmony between the Purpose, and the Covenant or Promise, and the Providence of God: This Purpose willeth life unto the world, upon the condution of their obedience and repentance: the Promise, in the Covenant of Workes, offereth life unto them likewise upon the same condition: the Providence of God the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost; provideth and applieth severall meanes of life unto the world, upon the same tearmes. And there is in every godly man, renewed after the Image of God, a just concord betwixt his Purpose, his Covenant or Promise, and his Performance: So is there here the like in God. You may read what Gods purpose is toward the world, by his Covenant made with the world; and you may see both what his Covenant with them, and purpose of them is, by his performance and execution of them both, in his actuall providence, in the fulnesse of time. If you ask how God may be said to purpose any thing that is not effectually accomplished? I answer, the act of Gods will, which hee is pleased to put forth, is alwayes accomplished: There is no good thing possible to be, though it never come to passe, (as that all men should in all things obey the word of God) but God passeth upon it some act of his will; hee at least approveth it to be good, and good it is, though it never come to passe: This act is not disappointed; for

Ans.

The Elect saved according to their workes :

as hee will prove it, so likewise doth hee approve it. Doth God command this or that good duty to be done, which is not done ? Yet that act of his will which hee puts forth is done : as hee willed to command it, so hee did command it. Doth God purpose to give life to the world upon condition of obedience, and accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as it is meet for them to doe ? Surely God performeth it on his part, although men performe it not on their part : their salvation is indeed disappointed, but not Gods will ; who never willed to give salvation to them, but upon that condition.

Examin.

The motions of the Spirit which are quenched, are godly motions, in the way of admonition, perswasion, exhortation ; and they are quenched not onely in the men of the world, but too often in the children of God ; the flesh too often prevailing in their lustings against the spirit, whereby are quenched for a time the motions of the Spirit ; that is, the regenerate part lusting against the flesh ; and consequently, the motions also of the Spirit of God admonishing and inviting unto good, either by the hearing of the word, or by the observation of Gods works. This worke of morall motion and invitation is wrought sometimes with a purpose to worke obedience conformable thereunto ; sometimes with no such purpose ; as often as God doth not make them effectuell to the working of obedience, whether in the unregenerate or regenerate, for even these sometimes (yea, too oft) erre from Gods wayes, and have their hearts hardened against his feare : for, if God had a purpose to make them effectuell, who should hinder him ? *Who hath resisted his will ? cui nullum humanum resistit arbitrium* (saith *Austin* ;) for, *ex nolentibus volentes facit*. Undoubtedly, morall invitations, if they be not yeilded unto, are justly said to be resisted, to what end soever they be made, whether to convert them, or to leave them without excuse ; even such an excuse as *Austin* speaks of, when hee saith, *Dicere solet humana superbia, Si scissem, fecissem*. I see no reason why you should deny the Elect to be saved according to their workes ; our Saviour doth manifest, *Mat. 25.* that they are so : *Come yee blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdome prepared for you, &c. For I was an hungred, and you fed mee, &c.* and can it be denied, but that God rewardeth every man according to his workes ? *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith,*

faith, faith Paul ; Henceforth there is laid up for mee a crown of righteousness. God is not unrighteous, to forget the labour of your love, &c. Looke to your selves, faith John, that wee may not lose the things that wee have done, but wee may receive a full reward. Piscator, a precise Divine, spareth not to professe, that *fides* is *causa salutis* : They are not, I confesse, *causa meritoria*, as sinne is *causa damnationis* ; but they are *causa dispositiva*, according to the Apostles phrase, *God hath made us meet partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light*. Neither doe I see any reason why you should oppose grace and good workes, in the point of salvation, howsoever they are opposed in the point of justification : The place you point unto for prooffe, treats not of the salvation of glory, but of the salvation of grace, consisting in effectually calling ; as the Text it selfe manifesteth. Had you spoken plainly, as you might, and as sometimes you doe, even in this Section, more than once ; as when you say, *Gods Purpose willett life to the world, upon the condition of their obedience and repentance*, it would manifestly appeare, that there was no reason to distinguish the Elect from the Reprobate, in this Purpose of God, seeing it equally passeth upon them both. For, undoubtedly, Gods Purpose is not to give the Elect life, but upon condition of their obedience and repentance. And likewise, his Purpose was to condemne all, one as well as another, upon the condition of their disobedience and unrepentance. But, had you dealt thus plainly, then you would be driven to acknowledge another decree, which alone puts the difference between the Elect and the Reprobate ; and that is, the decree of God to shew mercy, in giving the grace of obedience and repentance unto the one ; and of hardening, in denying the grace of obedience and repentance unto the other. But this plaine-dealing had utterly marred the state of your present discourse, in this particular. Yet, to touch something by the way ; How, I pray, doth God the Father, by the end of the Creation of his workes and Providence, beare witness to this Point, that it is the will and good pleasure of God to save the Elect, not according to their owne workes, but his grace ? Secondly, if God the Sonne died for the whole world, Reprobate and Elect, how doth this testifie that onely a few, called the Elect, should be saved by Gods grace ? Is there any greater grace than the grace of Redemption by the blood of Christ, which is both of a satisfacto-

Repentance absolutely denied to Reprobates.

ry nature for all sinne, and of a meritorious nature to purchase all grace and all glory? And shall not God deale with Christ according to the exigence of his merits and satisfactions? whether they were meritorious and satisfactory so farre of their owne nature, or by the constitution of God, all is one. Last of all, as touching the motions of the Spirit, if they are no other then morall invitations, they tend to no other end then to bring all men alike unto salvation, in case they are obeyed; and to expose all alike unto condemnation, in case they are disobeyed. If wee speake of other motions making the former effectuall unto obedience and repentance, these being found onely in the Elect, are documents of Gods will and purpose to save them to whom they are granted; and as manifest a document, that Gods will and purpose is not to save them to whom they are denied.

As for the harmony you speake of, between Gods Purpose and Covenant, herein is your error two-fold: First, in that you apply this wholly to the world, to Reprobates; whereas it concerns, as I have shewed, the Elect as well as the Reprobate; the reason whereof is, because it respects onely the collating of salvation, and inflicting of condemnation, which have their course upon condition. But there is another worke of Gods Providence, concerning the giving or denying of grace for performing the condition of life: And this worke is not performed upon any condition, but meerly according to the good pleasure of God, in shewing mercy to whom hee will, and hardening whom he will. And the Purpose of God for the execution of these is clearly absolute, without all colour of condition. And whereas you conceive this Purpose of God, thus absolute, concerns onely the Elect, that is your second error: For, God doth not more absolutely grant the gift of obedience and repentance unto his Elect, than hee doth deny it unto Reprobates; as I doubt not but will be made clearly to appeare, if you should come to a Collation hereabout. But I doe not thinke you have any purpose to deale upon this, but carry your selfe in a way of your owne, not exactly considered, wherein confusion, of things that are to be distinguished, doth afford you the best service. As for the third, which this harmony you speake of comprehends, to wit, the Providence of God, I left that out, because you shape to your selfe such a Providence of God, as whereby God did provide for all men, in all ages, sufficient,

ficient meanes of grace, to bring them to obedience and repentance: which seemes to be the opinion of the Author who wrote the two bookes *De vocatione Gentium*. For the justification of which conceit, though *Arminians* now-adayes relye much upon that Author, in this particular, I freely confesse, I know no reason, nor colour of reason. As for the comparison you make between a godly regenerate man and God, you might as well have shap'd it betweene many an honest heathen man and God. But you consider not a most momentous difference; man purposeth to doe things upon conditions, the performance or not performance whereof he is not able to fore-see, much lesse able to dispose of efficacy to performe the condition to whom hee will, and to deny it to whom hee will; all which is incident unto God, and casts us necessarily upon the acknowledgement of an absolute Purpose in God to performe this, as hee thinkes good; which is not to be found in man. Againe, you conceive this Purpose and Covenant of God to be made onely with the world, who will never performe it: Man enters upon no such Purposes and Covenants; but rather such, the conditions whereof are as soon performed as not performed. And I wonder you should swallow this comparison, as exact, not considering the foule disproportion that is found therein between God and man: But affection to our owne opinion, I confesse, is apt to abuse us, and make us take notice onely of that which makes for us, not of that which makes much more against us.

As for the Objection here inserted, in the Answer whereunto, you trouble your selfe not a little, you might well have spared your paines, and answered in briebe, that though it were very strange that any thing should not be accomplished which God doth will absolutely; yet, surely, it is nothing strange, that that should not be accomplished which God doth will to come to passe onely upon a condition; for, the condition failing, there is no reason why wee should expect the accomplishment thereof. And such is the will of God which here you propose concerning the world, namely, in willing that they shall be saved, on condition of their obedience and repentance; damned, in case of their disobedience and impenitency. Yet, it is not amisse to consider what you let fall in your Answer, to an Objection very needlesse, and which no wise man, amongst them who are adverse to you in this opinion, would

Whether Gods willing the worlds repentance,

frame ; *That act of Gods will (you say) which it pleaseth God to put forth, is alwayes accomplished :* I demand then, as touching this will of God whereby hee wills life to the world upon their obedience and repentance, whether it be accomplished or no ? If it be, then it is accomplished in their condemnation ; for, certainly, it is not accomplished in their salvation. And to this effect, I presume, tends your answer in the next Section. That which followes, when you say, *There is no good thing possible to be, though it never come to passe, (as that all men in all things should obey the word of God) but that God passeth upon it some act of his will ;* This, I say, is nothing to the purpose ; and that for two reasons : First, because it proceeds of morall good ; whereas the objects arising from the consideration of God willing salvation to the world, upon their obedience and repentance, had not its course of good morall, which is mans duty ; but of some good naturall, which he should receive by way of reward. Secondly, accomplishment of a thing willed, consists not in the approving of it, but in bringing of it to passe ; as all men know, by common notion. When as you say, as touching *Bonum*, that *God as hee will prove it, so hee dath approve it ;* as if approving of it were for the present, and proving of it were for the time to come, is so wilde an expression, that I cannot comprehend it. Wee use by proving a thing, to approve it as good ; and not first approve it, and then prove it. As little to the purpose is that which followeth, as when you say, *When God commands a duty, his will of command is accomplished :* But, whereas God is said to will the thing that hee commands, here ariseth a question, how that can be said to be willed by God, which most commonly is not accomplished ? For, albeit the will of command is accomplished, by the commanding of this or that, yet Gods will of the thing commanded seemes not to be accomplished, unlesse the thing willed by God be sometimes brought to passe. The truth is, your opinion seemes to be, That God not onely willeth the salvation of the world, upon the condition of their repentance, (for that is no more to will their salvation, than their damnation) but that God willeth and desireth their salvation absolutely, in as much as hee willeth and desireth their repentance. I confesse you doe not in expresse termes profess as much ; namely, that God willeth and desireth the repentance of Reprobates ; yet hitherto you seeme to tend, in this discourse of yours, though concerning
this

this you say, no more than this, *That God gives meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as is meet for him*: which while you professe, I doubt you understand not your owne meaning; and therefore no marvell if others doe not understand it: For, how farre he doth help them, you expresse in a very uncertaine manner; which is rather to conceale, than to discover and expresse your meaning. But I will endeavour to bolt it out. These meanes you speake of are either morall onely, consisting in instructing them wherein this obedience doth consist, and urging them by perswasion thereunto; or, in affording, besides this, some efficacious operation of Gods Spirit, to worke them to this obedience. Now, this latter cannot be your meaning; for if this were afforded them, their obedience, certainly, would be wrought: but the world, of whom you speake, doe never perform this obedience. Now, in granting the other, there is not so much evidence of Gods will that they shall performe this obedience, as by the denying of this wee have evidence, that his will is not that they shall performe this obedience. Againe, in respect of meanes morall, can any be saved without the meanes of true faith and true repentance? I thinke you will not say they can: Then consider, have all men sufficient instruction unto the performance of true faith and true repentance? How will you be able to make this good? Hand over head, you say, *God gives meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience, so farre as is meet for him to doe*: yet, I am perswaded, you are not able to make this good, taking it according to the confuse generality wherein you expresse it. For, is it not meet for God to afford any Nation or particular persons his word and Gospel, as well as it is meet for him to afford it us? Nay, is it not as meet for God to afford any other person both the outward meanes, and the inward efficacious operation of his holy Spirit, to worke them unto faith and true repentance, as well as by these meanes hee hath been pleased to worke us hereunto? This meetnesse, what is it but that which Schoolmen call, *justitia condecencia*, and which they professe doth accompany every action of God? So that had God afforded the same grace to others which hee hath afforded unto us, hee had carried himselfe therein meetly, that is, justly, *justitia condecencia*. Againe, had hee denied the same grace to us which hee hath denied unto others, he had herein also carried himselfe meetly, or

Whether God purposed life on condition of obedience,

decently, that is, justly, *justitia condecencie*. I am sorry to observe from such good mens pens such illusions to have their course, to the obscuring of the grace of God, and his sovereignty of dispensing it to whom hee will. This very ayre I find breathed forth in the writings of others, and it seemes to mee very probable, that they have derived it from hence.

Anfw.

Besides, to cleare this point more fully, the will of God towards the world is put forth in a disjunct axiome; viz. either to give life unto the world, upon the condition of their obedience; or to inflict death, upon the condition of their disobedience. Now, as in a disjunct axiome the whole proportion is true, if either part be true; so the will put forth in a disjunct axiome is alwayes accomplished, if either act be accomplished.

But if it be objected, how may it appeare this will of God to give life to the world, upon condition of their obedience, is serious and not pretended; since if hee would hee is able to give them such hearts as would cause them to obey him?

I answer; That God willeth it seriously, appeares manifestly by the declaration of his will already mentioned; viz. his Oath, his Covenant, yea, and the workes of each Person in the Trinity, tending to this end, to give life to the world: all which it were blasphemy to thinke they were not done seriously. Doth the living God sweare, and not sweare in earnest? God forbid. Doth God enter into Covenant with his creature, and intend no performance of promise according to his Covenant? farre be it from the just and holy God to doe it, and from us to imagine it. Shall we thinke each Person in the Trinity slighteth the worke of the salvation of mankind; because mankind slighteth to worke out their salvation with the Trinity?

But, besides the declaration of Gods will, thus seriously expressed, I produce the teares of our Saviour over Jerusalem, lamenting their carelesse neglect of the day of their peace: which argued, not onely in Christ as man, a serious compassion of their affected ignorance and misery; but also, as God, a tender consideration of their peace, and of providing the meanes for it. Moreover, what shall wee thinke of those passionate exclamations? Oh, that there were in this people an heart to feare mee, and to keep my commandements alwayes, that it may goe well with them, and with their children for ever! Oh, that they were wise, that they under-

understood this, that they would consider their latter end ! Oh, that my people had hearkened unto mee, and that Israel had walked in my wayes ! I should soon have subdued their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries. *Do not all these speeches expresse an earnest and serious affection in God, as concerning the conversion and salvation of this people, whereof sundry died in their sinnes ? It is true, God might have given them such hearts as to have feared and obeyed him ; which though hee did not, yet his will that they had such hearts was serious still. To cleare it by a comparison : The father of the family hath both his son and servant dangerously sick of the stone ; to heale them both, the father useth sundry medicines, even all that art prescribeth, except cutting : when hee seeth no other remedy, he perswades them both to suffer cutting, to save their lives : they both refuse it ; yet his sonne hee taketh, and bindeth him hand and foot, and causeth him to endure it, and so saveth his life. His servant also hee urgeth with many vehement inducements, to submit himselfe to the same remedy ; but if a servant obstinately refuse, hee will not alwayes strive with him, nor enforce him to such breaking and renting of his body. But yet, did not his Master seriously desire his healing and life, though hee did not proceed to the cutting asunder of his flesh, which hee saw his servant would not abide to heare of ? So in this case, both the elect and men of this world are dangerously sicke of a stony heart ; to heale both sorts the Lord useth sundry meanes ; promises, judgements, threatnings, and mercies : when all faile, hee perswades them to breake their hearts and the stone thereof, with cutting and wounding of their consciences : when they refuse, hee draweth them both ; the one with his almighty power, the other with the cords of man, (viz. such as are resistible) to this cutting and wounding, that their soules might live : and the elect are brought to yeeld ; and the men of this world break all cords asunder, and cast away such bonds from them. Shall we now say, God did not seriously desire the healing of such mens hearts, because hee procured not to bind them with strong cords, to breake them with such woundings as they will not abide to heare of ? Thus having laid downe the grounds of my judgement touching the first Point, That there is a will and purpose in God for to reward the world as well with life, upon condition of obedience ; as*

O 3

with.

Whatsoever God wills, hee wills seriously.

with death, upon condition of disobedience; I come now to the grounds of the second Point.

Examin.

You proceed in clearing a difficulty devised and shaped without all ground; as if any sober man would find it strange, that a conditionate will of God should not be accomplished as often as the condition failes. And to this purpose you make use of the nature of a disjunct axiome. All-along I favour others that have grased here, yet have not rested themselves contented with this, but proceeded further to more erroneous opinions.

A second objection you propose, in the second place, the solution whereof you seeme to travell with, much more than of the former: and yet the objection is altogether as causelesse, and without all just ground, as the former. I have now been something more than ordinarily conversant in these Controversies, for the space of seventeen yeares; I never yet met with any of our Divines, or any other, that made any question whether Gods will, being granted to passe on any object, were serious yea or no: I should thinke, there is no intelligent man living that makes any doubt of this; but puts it rather out of all question, that whatsoever God wills, hee wills it seriously. I confesse, the *Arminians* doe usually obtrude some such things on our Divines, yet not altogether such; for they doe not obtrude upon us, as if wee said, God doth not will seriously that which hee willerth; but rather, that hee doth not seriously exhort and admonish all those whom hee doth admonish to beleeve and repent: as if hee made shew onely of desiring their obedience and salvation, when indeed hee doth not. Yet, you seeme to sweat not a little in debellating this man of straw. Upon these termes I might easily dispatch my selfe of all further trouble, in examining your elaborate Answer to so causelesse an Objection: but I will not; for it may be you insperse something by the way of opposition to that which you doe professe; which is this, That God doth not at all will the obedience and repentance of any but those who are his Elect. And I would not pretermitt any evidence you bring to countenance your cause, in opposition to our Tenent, unanswered. That Gods Oath, or Covenant, or the workes of any Person in the Trinity tends to the end by you mentioned, namely, *to give life to the world*; is utterly untrue. Likewise, it is utterly untrue, that you have

have hitherto proved any such thing ; For, that which you here deliver as Gods end in giving life, is proposed simply and absolutely ; but that which hitherto you have endeavoured to prove, is onely this, that *Gods will was to give the world life conditionally* : to wit, upon their obedience and repentance : and that, as, in the last place coming to the point, you have expressed it in a disjunct axiome, thus, *To give life to the creature, upon his obedience ; or to inflict death upon his disobedience* : Now let any sober man judge, whether in this case the will of God be more to give life, than to inflict death ; more passing upon the salvation of the creature, than upon his eternall condemnation ? Could you prove, that God doth will at all the salvation of any other save his Elect, I would forthwith grant hee wills it seriously : I should thinke it no lesse than blasphemy to thinke, that God doth either will, or sweare, or covenant, or doe that which hee doth, not seriously ; as blasphemy consists in attributing that to God which doth not become him. I nothing doubt but that if all and every one should beleeve and repent, all and every one should be saved : and none other thing hitherto have you so much as adventured to prove, in this particular whereupon now we are. But then, it behoves you to look unto it, on the other side, how you cleare your selfe from blasphemy in the same kind, while you maintain that God doth will the salvation of those which shall never be saved : which not in my judgement only, but in the judgement of *Austin*, of old, doth mainly trench upon Gods omnipotency ; for, if hee would save them, but doth not, hee is hindered and resisted by somewhat ; and, consequently, his will is not omnipotent, nor irresistible. And more than this, here-hence it will follow, that either God continues still to will their salvation, even after they are damned, or else God is changed. And if these be not blasphemies, and foule ones too, I know not what is blasphemy. I know not what you meane by, *slighting the salvation of mankind* ; but, sure I am, it is your own opinion, that in case man slights the working out of his salvation, God is so farre from willing his salvation, that hee hath untractably decreed his everlasting condemnation. As for the salvation of mankind, this being an indefinite speech, wee are ready with your selfe to maintaine, that God hath peremptorily decreed (to wit) the salvation of his Elect ; and it is not faire to make use of indefinite speeches, the truth whereof

Gods consideration of Ieruselems peace, what.

is confessed on all hands, by prejudice of an indefinite truth to draw your Readers to the embracing of your definite Tenet, which is void of truth. And can it be denied by you, that God from everlasting hath decreed the condemnation of them, whose salvation you would not have us thinke he slighteth?

Our Saviours teares not onely argued in him a serious compassion, as man, but a serious desire also of their salvation; and whom hee wept over, out of that love hee owed unto them (being made under the Law) hee was bound to desire their salvation, as wee are bound to desire the salvation of all those to whom we are sent; though this desire on all hands ought to have course (and that by the very Law of God) with submission to his will: But, that it argued in him, as God, a will or desire to save them, your modesty would not permit you to expresse; although the face of your Tenet is as manifestly set towards this marke, as ever our Saviours face was set towards *Ierusalem*. As for the consideration of their peace, which you attribute unto him, were it extant, it were impossible but as God hee should consider it; were it to come to passe, it were no lesse impossible but hee should purpose it and effect it: but seeing it was never to come to passe, hee could no otherwise consider it then as a thing possible, but such as should never come to passe; and it was equally impossible, as the former, that hee should not so consider it. But I doe easily imagine what you meane, though you are very loath to speake it out; (which, to deale plainly with you, is nothing faire) save that I am verily perswaded it proceeds not out of any ill mind in you, but partly out of feare (by speaking plainly) to give offence to good men; and partly out of some conscientiousnesse of your inability to justifie it: namely, that Christ, as God, did consider it as a thing possible, with a tender affection desiring it. And indeed, otherwise the word *tender* added to consideration, attributed to God, comes in very incongruously; for, in proper speech, to consider a thing tenderly, is to consider a thing passionately; which is incident to man, but not to God. As for the other object which you make of Gods consideration, namely, the providing of means for their peace; this is brought in too too unseasonably; for the time thereof was at this time out of season, as our Saviour himselfe signifieth when hee saith, *But now they are hid from thine eyes*: And were it never so seasonable, yet were it little or nothing

thing to the purpose; for what outward meanes soever he affords them, yet if hee afford them not the efficacious operation of his holy spirit, it is a manifest document, that his purpose is to glorifie himselfe in their everlasting condemnation, rather than in their salvation. But whereas hitherto you have but prevaricated, pleading for that which no man denyes; namely, that Gods purpose towards them is but in a disjunct manner, either for salvation if they obey, or for condemnation in case they disobey; or, onely in a conditionate manner willing life unto them, and that, upon such a condition as hee well knowes will never be performed by them; all-along concealing your opinion, and sparing to deale plainly, in an open profession thereof: Now, at length, you are come to broach it; and that is, not onely that *God wills either their salvation or condemnation, according as they shall be found to repent or not repent*; or, that *hee wills life unto them, upon condition of their obedience and repentance*; giving hitherto not the least inckling of your meaning to be this, that *hee wills also and desires their obedience and repentance*. Now you take heart to open this mystery of your meaning also, namely, that *there is in God an earnest and serious affection, as concerning the conversion and salvation of the world, which never are, nor shall be saved*: Yet here also you give cause to complain, that you walk not with a right foot, sparing to expresse your meaning home; for you apply it onely to the people of Israel, which is an indefinite terme, and may be applied to the Elect; concerning whom, there is no question of *Gods earnest and serious affection concerning their salvation*: *All are not Israel, that are of Israel* (saith the Apostle;) So that Israell are Gods chosen, in the Apostles phrase: And there is an *universitas electorum*, yea, and *mundus electorum* too; as the Author of the bookes *De vocatione Gentium* observeth. Again, that which, in the places alledged by you, is applied to Israel onely, you, by your Tenet, doe, and must extend to all that are not elect, to the very Turks and Saracens of these dayes, though you have no such exclamations to serve your turne withall, to prove Gods earnest and serious affection concerning their salvation, though this be the most colourable Argument which you have to stand you in stead, in this particular. But, why should a slight and colourable interpretation of holy Scripture cast you, or any sober man, upon such an opinion, the absurdity whereof

is evident by the light of nature? For, doth not God know full well that, notwithstanding all the meanes which hee useth to bring them to obedience, they will still continue in the hardnesse of their heart? Doth hee not also know full well, that hee could give them such a grace as should break the hardnesse of their heart, and make them humble and obedient, with upright hearts? And withall, hath hee not resolved to deny them this grace, which he knew full well would prove effectuell to their conversion, and to grant them only such a grace as hee knew would prove ineffectuall? Now, in this case, let every sober Reader judge, whether God hath any affection to all (much lesse earnest) unto their salvation; and whether hee meaneth not rather to glorifie himselfe in their utter condemnation? To pretermitt here my former Arguments, as namely, That this serious and earnest affection, concerning their salvation, must still continue, even after they are damned, or else God is mutable. And, that if God doth earnestly desire their obedience and repentance, that they might be saved; in case they do not obey and repent, it followeth, that God is not able to effect it. But neverthelesse I am willing to consider the strength of your Argument: it is grounded upon a certaine Scripture phrase, *Oh that there were in this people an heart to feare me! Oh that they were wise! Oh that my people had hearkened unto mee! &c.* Is it not great pity that good men, and good Divines, should be carried away into odde opinions, upon the slight consideration of a phrase? The Hebrew phrase runnes thus, *Quis dabit ut cor eorum sit huiusmodi (i.e. ita dispositum) illis, ut timeant me omnibus diebus vite sue?* This is, *Quis prestabis? Who shall give, or effect, that such an heart were in them, that they might feare mee all their dayes?* Now, I pray, consider; if this were spoken properly, might wee not answer God according to his owne language, and say, O Lord, doest thou aske who shall give or make good unto them such an heart? why who should doe such a worke as this but thy selfe? for thou hast made the heart, and thou alone canst change it; we cannot change an haire of our head, much lesse our heart: and thou in thy Covenant of grace hast undertaken this, even to be our Lord and God, to sanctifie us; and to this purpose thou hast given us thy Sabbath, as a signe that thou the Lord doest sanctifie us: to this end thou hast given us thy word, which is that truth of thine,
according

according unto godlinesse, which alone can sanctifie us : and thou hast promised to *circumcise our hearts, and the hearts of our children, that they shall love the Lord our God with all our hearts ; and as to love thee, so to feare thee also ; and that, all our dayes ; and to this purpose, to put thy feare in our hearts, that wee shall never depart from thee ; yea, and to put thy spirit within us, and to cause us to walke in thy statutes, and in thy judgements, and to doe them.* And, surely, if God desires such an heart to be in us, hee will not faile to give us such an heart ; seeing hee alone is able to worke such an heart in us. Therefore I conclude, this is not to be understood properly, but figuratively : And you may as well inferre out of that of the Psalmist, *The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his eares are open unto their prayers,* that God hath eyes and eares, in proper speech ; as out of such places as these to conclude, that humane ineffectuall desires and wishes and velleities are found in God. If God transerre upon himselfe the members of our bodies, in a figure of speech called *ανθρωποπάθεια*, why may hee not as well transerre upon himselfe, by the same figure of speech, the desires and affections of our minds ? especially, considering that God hath made us apt to be moved and wrought upon by such passionate expressions ; and it is Gods usuall course to worke in all things agreeably to their natures. And I make no question but such expressions are usually prevalent with true Israelites, with Gods owne people ; not so much by the force of a passionate expression, which is accommodated to the condition of mans nature, as chiefly by the operation of Gods Spirit, whose sword the Word of God is.

I doubt not but Gods will is *serious*, what way or course soever it takes ; but you are very adventnrus upon your Readers credulity, in endeavouring to perswade him, that God willet such a gracious heart in them, in whom hee means not to worke ; considering, as I presume your selfe beleeve (although this discourse of yours makes mee not a little stagger in this mine apprehension) that God alone is able to worke such an heart in any : yet you labour to expedite a facile way unto our faith, or credulity rather, to take hold of your Proposition by a familiar comparison ; *A father (you say) perswades both his sonne and his servant to be cut, both being dangerously sicke of the stone ; but when perswasions will not serve with his sonne, hee taketh him and bindeth him*

Conversion is an act of Gods mercie,

hand and foot, and causeth him to endure it : The servant hee continueth to perswade to endure the like course of cure, but proceedeth no further. In this case, you say, the Master doth seriously desire the healing and life of his servant, though he did not proceed to the cutting asunder of his flesh : I grant all this ; but I wonder not a little that your selfe doe not observe the incongruity in this comparifon, which on no side is futable ; for the sonne, in this case, is made to be cut against his will, that hee may be healed ; but God forceth no man to conversion and repentance against his will, that hee may be healed ; for, indeed, *voluntas non potest cogi*, at least in respect of *actus elicit*, wherein consists repentance and conversion. On the other side, the servant is no more willing to be cut than the son, for it is not in the power of man to change the will either of servant or of sonne ; but this is in Gods power, and with an omnipotent facility, as *Austin* speakes, *Omnipotenti facilitate convertit, & ex nolentibus volentes facit* : Now, put the case that the Master should know, that of all the meanes hee could use to make his servant willing to endure the cutting, none but one would prevaile with him, and that one would prevaile with him to make him willing ; should the Master use all other meanes, which hee well knew would prove ineffectuall, and purposely forbore the other, which hee well knew would prove prevalent ? In this case, speake freely, I pray, whether this man did seriously and earnestly desire the cutting and healing of his servant, and not rather the contrary ? To put the case home unto you ; you know what admonition *David* upon his death-bed gave to *Solomon* concerning *Shimei*, *Thou shalt not count him innocent, for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to doe unto him ; and thou shalt cause his hoare head to goe downe to the grave with blond* : yet withall, *Solomon* must have a care of *David* his fathers oath ; for when *Shimei* came to meet *David* at *Jordan*, *David* sware unto him by the Lord, saying : *I will not slay thee with the sword* : Now while *Solomon* meditated on some course to take with *Shimei*, suppose God should reveale unto him, saying, *If thou proposest such a condition unto him, to wit, of building him an house in Jerusalem, and to stay there, and not passe over the brook Kidron, hee will transgresse ; but if thou proposest any other like condition, hee will observe it : and hereupon Solomon should be moved to propose this condition, which hee* knew.

knew *Shimei* would transgress; judge, I pray, whether this course proposed to *Shimei* were an evidence of *Solomons* earnest and serious affection, concerning the saving of *Shimei's* life; and not rather concerning his destruction? In like sort, when God persuades many by his Ministers to make them new hearts and new spirits, and himselfe alone, by the power of his Spirit, is able to take the stony heart out of their bowels, and give them an heart of flesh; when he resolves to afford this grace unto some, but not unto others; let every one judge hereby, whether God can be said earnestly to desire the changing of their hearts, when he resolves to forbear that course which alone can change them? No, no, this discourse savoureth strongly of a conceit, that it is in the power of an unregenerate man to change his owne heart, and of an heart of stone to change it into an heart of flesh: And in this case, I confesse, it were very probable that God should earnestly desire it; provided that any ineffectuall and changeable desires were incident unto God.

That when God putteth forth the second act of positive retribution, viz. the rejection of the world, or decree of their condemnation, God doth behold and consider the world, especially men of riper yeares, not in massa primitus corrupta, nor as newly fallen in Adam; but as voluntarily falling off, by some act of carelesse and wilfull disobedience. To prove this, I need not produce other reasons then what I have formerly alledged in the fore-going Point; for when God did expresse, by his oath, his will and good pleasure to be, not for the death, but life and conversion of sinners, was it not after the fall of Adam, and all his posterity in him? then, notwithstanding the presupposall of the fall, God had not yet rejected the creature; but, as hee there declareth himselfe, still retaineth and reserveth thoughts of peace towards them, even a desire of their conversion unto life. Answ.

Againe, with whom did the Lord enter into a Covenant of life and death, upon condition of obedience and disobedience? was it not with Adam onely, and his posterity in his loynes, in the state of innocency, by the law written in their heart? Was it not also after Adams fall renewed to all his posterity, both Jewes and Gentiles? Then, yet God had not cast them away in the fall, though the fall had justly deserved it; but expectteth yet further to see how they will yet keep this renewed Covenant with him, before hee

Whether the Fall occasioned the worlds Reprobation.

cast them off as Reprobates : Even Cain himselfe, the eldest Sonne of Reprobation, is after the fall offered acceptance of Gods hand if hee doe well. Moreover, is it not after the fall that the Father, by his workes of creation and providence, judgements and mercies, &c. the Sonne by his enlightening the world, by his death and ministry of his servants ; and the Holy Ghost by his calling and knocking at the hearts of the wicked, doe all strive with men, even to this very end, to turne them to the Lord, that iniquity may not be their destruction ? If therefore all the Persons in the Trinity doe provide severall helpfull meanes for the conversion and salvation of the world ; of the world, I say, now after the fall lying in wickednesse, surely God did not then upon the fall reprobate the world unto eternall condemnation and perdition. If you say, God might well reprobate the world unto condemnation upon the fall, and yet still after the fall use meanes for their conversion and salvation ; because those meanes doe but further aggravate their condemnation : I answer, these doe indeed further aggravate their condemnation, but it is but by accident onely, by their neglect and abuse of them ; but the proper end which God himselfe, of himselfe, aims at in the use of these meanes, himselfe plainly expresseth it to be, not the aggravation or procurement of their condemnation, but the restoring of them to salvation and life ; as hath been before declared. So then, to draw all to an head, the summe of this first reason is, If God after the fall doe retaine a will and purpose to restore life to the world upon an equall condition, then hee did not upon the fall, or upon the onely consideration of the fall, reject the world of the ungodly unto their utter perdition. But, you see, God retaineth after the fall an holy will and purpose of restoring life unto the world upon an equall condition, as appeareth by his Oath, by his Covenant, and by his Workes ; therefore the conclusion, which is the point in hand, is evident.

Examin.

I marvell what you meane to call Gods decree of condemnation his act of retribution ; retribution being an act temporall and transient, the decree of God is an act immanent and eternall : And therefore it is not so handsomely said to be the putting forth of an act, for so much as it is immanent and not transient. 'Tis manifest, I confesse, that sin is alwayes precedent to the retribution of punishment ; as it is without controversie, that sinne neither is nor can be antecedent to Gods decree, sinne being temporall,

but

but all Gods decrees eternall. And I have found it by experience to be an usuall course with our Adversaries, to confound condemnation with the decree of condemnation. And *Justus* himselfe, very incongruously, in my judgement, calls this decree, *Pradamnatio*; to make the fairer place, as I guesse, for *sins* *pracedencie* thereunto, at least in consideration: But no necessity urgeth us to any such course; and wee may well maintaine, that God in this decree of condemnation hath alwayes the consideration of that sinne for which hee purposeth to damne them; for, undoubtedly, hee decrees to condemne no man but for sinne. It is impossible it should be otherwise; condemnation, in the notion thereof, formally including sinne. But I like not your expressions in the distinction you make, saying, *God considers men in this sinne, not as newly fallen in Adam, but as voluntarily falling off* (you mean long after) *by some act of carelesse and wilfull disobedience*. When God made this decree, they were not newly (that is, a little before) fallen in *Adam*; for that fall in *Adam* was temporall, but the decrees of God are eternall: And to consider as newly fallen, when as yet they were not, much lesse were they fallen, is not so much to consider, as to erre or feigne. But like as God decreed to suffer all to fall in *Adam*, and many also to continue both therein, and in bringing forth the bitter fruits thereof even untill death; so he purposed to condemne them for those sinnes: but take heed you doe not make an order of *prius* and *posterius* between these decrees; lest either you make the decree of condemnation precedent to the decree of permission of those sinnes for which they shall be condemned, which will be directly contradictory to your Tenet here; or, making Gods decree of permitting such sinnes for which they shall be condemned precedent to his decree of condemnation, (whereunto you doe entline unawares) which will cast you upon miserable inconveniences, and that by your owne rule already delivered; for if the decree of permitting sinne be first in intencion, then, by the rules received by you, it should be last in execution; that is, men should be condemned for sinne, before they be permitted to sinne: But the conjunction of these decrees into one, as in the same moment of nature and reason, will both prevent this inconvenience, and also justifie Gods decree of condemnation, to proceed upon the consideration of those sinnes for which hee purposeth to condemne them. But then there is
another

The decrees of Election and Reprobation parallel d.

another point of great moment, which in like manner must be accorded unto, though you seeme to be little aware of it, (though, I willingly confesse, this over-sight is very generall) namely, that God decreeth the salvation of none of ripe yeares, but upon, or with a joynt consideration of their faith, repentance, and good workes. For, let us first make the decrees of salvation and condemnation matches: As for example, Reprobation, as it is accounted the decree of condemnation, is a decree of punishing with everlasting death. Now, if you will match Election unto this, as it is the decree of salvation, it must be conceived as a decree of rewarding with everlasting life. Now let any man judge, whether this decree must not as necessarily be conjoynd with the consideration of faith, repentance, and good workes, in men of ripe years; as the decree of condemnation, or of punishing with everlasting death, must be conjoynd with the consideration of those sinnes for which God purposeth to punish them. And I will further demonstrate it thus: Like as the decree of permitting some men to sinne, and to continue therein to the end, and Gods decree of condemning for sinne, are joynt decrees, neither afore nor after other; and consequently, the decree of condemning for sinne must necessarily be conjoynd with the consideration of sinne: In like sort, Gods decree of giving some faith, repentance, and good workes, and his decree of rewarding them with everlasting life, are joynt decrees, neither of them afore or after other; and consequently, Gods decree of saving them, and rewarding them with everlasting life, is joynd with the consideration of their faith, repentance, and good workes. Now that these are joynt decrees I prove thus: First, the decree of salvation cannot precede the decree of giving faith and repentance; for if it should, then salvation were the end of faith and repentance; but salvation is not the end, as I prove thus: The end is such as doth necessarily bespeake the meanes tending thereunto; but salvation doth not necessarily bespeake faith and repentance tending thereunto: for, God intending the salvation of Angels, brought it to passe without faith and repentance; as likewise, the salvation of many an infant hee brings to passe without faith and repentance. Secondly, the end of Gods actions can be nothing but himselfe, and his owne glory; and therefore salvation it selfe must have for end the glory of God. Now, examine what glory of God is manifested in mans
salvation,

The decree of faith precedes not the decree of salvation.

113

salvation, and it will forthwith appeare upon due examination, that the glory of God manifested in mans salvation, is such as whereunto not salvation only doth tend, but diverse other things joyntly concurring with salvation thereunto. As for example, Gods glory manifested on the elect, is in the highest degree of grace, but in the way of mercie mixt with justice: This requires permission of sin, the sending of Christ to make satisfaction for sinne, faith and repentance, (for Gods justice is seen partly in conferring salvation by way of reward) and last of all salvation. Out of all these results the glory of God in doing good to his creature in the highest degree of grace, proceeding in the way of mercie mixt with justice. Thirdly, if God gave faith and repentance to this end, to bring his elect unto salvation, as to the end thereof, then, by just proportion of reason, God should deny the gift of faith and repentance unto others; that is, to permit them finally to persevere in their sinnes, thereby to procure their condemnation as the end thereof: which you will not affirme, neither can it with any sobriety be affirmed. In the next place I will shew, that neither can the decree of giving faith and repentance, precede the decree of salvation; for if it should, then should faith & repentance be the last in execution; to wit, if it were first in intention, and consequently men should first be saved, and afterwards have faith and repentance granted unto them. Thus I have shewed my readinesse to concur with you in opinion in this particular; and that upon other grounds than yours: and whose grounds are more sound, yours or mine, I am content to remit it to the judgement of any indifferent Reader. As for your reason here mentioned, repeating onely what you have formerly delivered, as touching *the will and good pleasure of God*, not for *the death*, but for *the life*, not onely of the elect, but of all others also; the vanitie of this assertion of yours, I thinke I have sufficiently discovered. And I wonder you should carry it thus, *not of the death, but of the life*; when most an end you have carried it onely thus hitherto; that Gods willing their life, is onely upon condition of their obedience and repentance, not otherwise: Or, in a disjunct axiome, thus, Either of life in case they repent, or of death in case they did not repent; and what should move you to call this a willing to give them life, and not to inflict death? Why should you not rather call it a will to inflict death, and not to give life; considering that God was

Q

resol-

God may give, or deny, grace to whom he will.

resolved to deny them such grace, as would effectually bring them to obedience and repentance; and to grant them only such a grace, as he fore-knew full well, would never bring them to obedience and repentance? 1. *Cain* was of the familie of *Adam*, to whom the promise was made concerning the seed of the woman, that he should break the serpents head; and although *Cain* was offered acceptance upon his repentance, yet it followeth not that all were offered the same acceptance, even those that never received any tidings or promise concerning the *Messiah*. And the Apostle plainly signifies, that the *Gentiles* were not admonished to repent untill Christ was preached unto them, *Act.* 17. 30. But suppose it were so, yet this hinders nothing at all the precedencie of the decree of condemnation, unto the decree of giving such a Covenant and permitting them to despise it. For, because God purposed to damne them for such a sinne, therefore hee might decree to give them such a Covenant, and permit them, or expose them, (by leaving them destitute of his grace) to the despising of it: Not that I doe approve of any such conceit, as before I have manifested; but to shew how short your discourse falls of making good that which you undertake to prove. And I am much deceived, if you mistake not their tenet, who make reprobation to proceed upon the consideration of the corrupt masse in *Adam*: For, undoubtedly, their meaning hereupon is not to maintaine that God did purpose to condemne all reprobates only for the sin of *Adam*, or for originall sinne drawne from him: this were a very mad conceit. But supposing that by *Adams* fall an impotency of doing that which is good is come upon all; as it is free for God to give grace to whom he will, and so to bring them to salvation, the purpose whereof is called Gods election; so is it enough for God to deny grace to whom he will, and thereby to expose them to condemnation: the purpose whereof in God, is that which wee call Reprobation; which, as *Aquinas* saith, *Includit voluntatem permittendi peccatum, & damnationem inferendi pro peccato*. Now of this generall impotency of doing good, which cleaves unto all since the fall of *Adam*, you take no notice at all, though herein consists the very *æquæ* of these controversies but; carry your selfe throughout in such manner, as if, notwithstanding that shipwracke of grace, which all humane soules made in *Adam*, it were still as much in mans power to obey God, as it was before; or as

much in mans power to rise by repentance now after he is fallen, as it was in his power to stand in his integrity, and in obedience unto God before he was fallen. Put the case all were true that you deliver in the next place, namely, that God the Father, Sonne and Holy Ghost proceed in the way of admonition and exhortation to turne themselves to the Lord, that iniquitie might not be their ruine; yet this hinders not but that the decree of condemnation might be precedent to Gods decree of taking such a course, and permitting them to resist it. For, upon a purpose to condemne them for such a sinne, he might thereupon resolve to expose them to such a sinne: And if God should first decree to permit such a sinne, and then decree to condemne them for it, the permission of this sinne being first in intention, should by your owne rule be last in execution; that is, first men should be condemned for such a sin, and afterwards they should be suffered to commit it: Not that I maintaine any such order, but onely to represent the weakness of your discourse, approaching shrewdly to such a disorderly constitution of Gods decrees, and nothing at all preventing the most harsh tenet that can be devised. Again, this that here you deliver, were it granted you, yet doth it nothing hinder the corrupt mass in *Adam*, to be the object of Gods decree of condemnation. For, albeit God the Father, and God the Sonne faile not of performing all this you speak of, yet if by reason of the generall impotency which is come on all, they are nothing able to obey these motions of Gods spirit, and withall God purposeth to deny them a further grace to make them to obey; shall not this be sufficient to expose them to condemnation, even for this sinne of resisting the motions of Gods spirit? But now let us consider your discourse it selfe, and what weight it carrieth, which onely makes a shew of much, but comes to nothing in the end. First you please your selfe in devising distinct workes, applyed to the distinct persons in the Trinitie, without all ground in my judgement: Wee commonly say, *Opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt indivisibilia*. Were not the Sonne and the Holy Ghost as active in the creation, and are still in the workes of providence, as the Father? How Christ enlightened the world by his death is a mystery to me; his doctrine I confesse did, and much more the doctrine of his Apostles: But in this ministerie of Christs servants, were not the Father and the Holy Ghost as operative as the Sonne? As for the

What meant by turne them to the Lord.

knocking of the spirit at mens hearts, you nothing distinguish it, for ought I found hitherto, from the ministerie of Christs servants in admonishing and exhorting; which worke is yet the Fathers and the Sonnes aswell as the Spirits. But whereas you say, all this is done for this very end, *To turne them to the Lord, that iniquitie might not be their destruction*; I pray you observe your owne words well: all the operations you specify are drawn from these two heads, Instruction and Admonition to turn to the Lord; and the end of all this, you say, is to turne to the Lord. Put these together, that you may behold the sobriety of this discourse. God exhorts them to turne to the Lord, to this end, to turne them to the Lord: As much as to say, God exhorts them to turne to the Lord, to this end, that in case they obey his voice, and turne to the Lord which is their part, then God will performe his part also, and turne them to the Lord. But what need, I pray, of Gods worke in turning them to the Lord, after they have performed their part so well as to turne themselves to the Lord? Again, if God hath a purpose to turne them to the Lord, why doth he not? Is it because they refuse to performe some act, upon the performance whereof God would turne them to himself? Now I would gladly know what act that is, which God expects to be performed, that so he might turne them to the Lord. I am verily perswaded your selfe are not willing to be put to designe this: Is it the very act of turning to the Lord, or lesse, or more? If the very act of turning to the Lord, you fall upon a manifest absurditie before specified: if lesse then turning to the Lord, then 'tis lesse than a good act; and shall God reward that which is lesse then a good act with conversion unto him? What is it to conferre grace according to the workes of nature, if this be not? Yet I would faine know what this act is? Least of all will you say, 'tis more than turning to the Lord, for that should suppose conversion unto the Lord already wrought; and consequently, no need that God should turne them to the Lord, which supposeth that they were not before turned to the Lord at all. The providing of severall helpefull meanes for the salvation of the world after the fall, doth nothing hinder Gods reprobating of the world upon the fall unto eternall condemnation and perdition. For if hee purpose to deny them grace to obey these meanes, this shall bee sufficient to expose them to condemnation, even for the despising of

What meant by Gods purposing life upon an equall condition.

of those meanes of grace which God purposeth to provide for them; and accordingly the objection here proposed is sound. And whereas you answer, that these meanes doe aggravate their condemnation by accident onely; to wit, through their neglect and abuse of them: I answer, that this their neglect and abuse doth by necessary consequence follow upon Gods purpose to deny them effectually grace for the using of those meanes aright: like as upon Gods purpose to harden *Pharaohs* heart, that hee should not let *Israel* goe, it followed by necessary consequence, that *Pharaoh*, through the hardness of his heart, would not let *Israel* goe. But that Gods end is (as you say) the *restoring of men to salvation and life*; as if God did will and purpose any such thing, is utterly untrue, and nothing proved by you hitherto, but rather flatly contradictorie to that you have most an end delivered; partly in making Gods will of their salvation to be onely in a disjunct manner, and partly of a conditionate manner, which is no more to will their salvation, than their damnation, in case they were indifferent to performe either condition. But in case they be found unable to performe the condition of life, and most prone to performe the condition of death, God meaning not to give them such a grace as alone can relieve them, it is (manifestly) an evidence, that God wills their condemnation, and nothing at all their salvation. Not to mention any other arguments against this conceit; the one drawn from Gods omnipotency, the other from his immutabilitie.

In the recapitulation of this reason, you help your selfe with a phrase, and onely with a phrase: *God retaines a will and purpose to restore life to the world upon an equall condition.* Obedience is due to God, though man be not able to performe it. And therefore God, in requiring that which is due unto him, carrieth himselfe in an equall (I had rather say, in a just) course, though man becoming bankrupt, be not able to performe it. But in this case, namely, if God will not restore life, but upon performance of such a condition which he is utterly unable to performe, and withall purposeth to deny him that grace, which should inable him to performe it; is not this a manifest document, that God hath no purpose to restore life unto him? Yet I confesse, the phrase used is advantageous unto you; for, at the hearing of an equall condition, most are apt to conceive the condition to be such as lyeth

On those alone the Scripture pronounces Reprobation,

in a mans power to performe. But you have not hitherunto manifested any such opinion of mans abilitie: If you have entertained any such (as whereunto pastorall Divines, dealing much upon exhortation, are sometimes over-prone, though I see small cause why the opinion of mans impotency unto good should any whit rebate the edge of their exhortation) you should doe well to convince your adversaries by argument, and not circumvent them.

Ans. 2. From the condition of those men, upon whom the scriptures pronounce reprobation, or rejection; I no where read of reprobation, but of such men to whom the meanes of grace, or at least, of the knowledge of God in some measure or other have been offered in vaine. In the Old Testament, God pronounceth the house of Judah reprobate silver, rejected by him: But when? Not till they were all become revolters, and corrupters, and till the meanes hee had used to purge and cleanse them had been attempted in vaine. The bellows (saith hee) are burnt, the lead is consumed in the fire, the founder melteth in vaine, and reprobate silver shall men call them, because the Lord hath rejected them. When did God reject all further care of purging the people from their filthinesse any more? Not till after hee had used meanes to purge them, and they were not purged. When doth the Sonne of God, under the name of wisdom, reject the wicked? Not till after he had called upon them earnestly to return, & stretched out his hands unto them, & offered to poure out his spirit upon them; and they after all this, had set at nought his counsell, and despised the meanes of their owne reformation. Prov. 1.

In the New Testament, the Apostle speaks of reprobates, in case so powersfull a ministry as his was, so long a time dispensed unto them, and had notwithstanding been vainly received by them, and that as yet they knew not themselves to be in Christ. Yea, the Gentiles themselves, when did God give them up to a reprobate minde? Was it not after they had disregarded the acknowledging and glorifying of God, according to the meanes they had received? In a word, when doth God shut up the Sonnes of Adam, either Jewes or Gentiles, under enmitie against Christ, and set forth Christ in enmitie against them, thereby excluding them from atonement with him, or by him with God? Is it not after they are become the seed of the Serpent? Now, by the seed of the Serpent cannot be meant, all men fallen and corrupted in Adam by originall

sin

sin (though that fall was wrought by the suggestion and praetice of the Serpent) for then all the seed of Adam had been shut up in enmitie against Christ, and cut off from all fellowship with him their head. But by the seed of the Serpent I understand, all such men of the world, as haue the image of the old Serpent stamped upon them, which is a will set to doe the lusts of the devill. Saith our Saviour to Iohn. 8. the Jewes, Yee are of your father the devill, and the lusts of your Iohn. 3. father ye will doe: or, which is all one, an hatred of the light when it cometh amongst them; and which is a character of the devill, a lover of darknesse rather then light. Upon which point it is our Saviour butteth up the men of this world under condemnation, viz. When by the hatred of the light they have drunke in the venome, and received the image of the old Serpent; till which time, men are counted the seed of Adam: Or, if they be borne in the Church the seed of Abraham, rather then the seed of the Serpent. For our Divines doe wisely and justly maintaine against the Anabaptists, that the seed of Abraham, as pertaining to the Covenant, are not only his spirituall seed, partakers of his faith, but also his children after the flesh, till by their carelesse and willfull disobedience they have excluded themselves from the Covenant of Abraham: From whence it is, that all the seed of Abraham, even the carnall seed, are sealed up by Circumcision or Baptisme under the Covenant of Abraham. Neither are they excluded from hope of benefit by the Covenant and the seales and ordinances of it, till that, with prophane Esau, they despise this their birth-right, and sell the pledges of their inheritance for some base and sensuall lust. Now if all such are to be accounted the seed of Abraham, till, by despising the Covenant, they have broken off themselves from partaking with him in the fatnesse of the olive; then surely, even the carnall seed of Abraham are not the seed of the Serpent from their originall pollution, but doe become afterwards by their actuall voluntary rebellion.

As there is an election eternall, and election temporall, so Examin. in both senses the word is taken in holy scripture. Of election eternall we read, *Ephes. 1. 4.* where God is said to have chosen us in Christ, that wee should be holy, before the foundation of the world. Of election temporall wee read, *1 Cor. 1. 26.* Brethren, you see your calling, how that not many wisemen after the flesh, &c. But God hath chosen the foolish things, &c. Where Election

Finall continuance in sinne an evidence of Reprobation.

is taken as all one with vocation, in proportion whereunto we must distinguish of reprobation. And like as Election temporall is all one with effectuall vocation, as when men find mercy at the hands of God to obey their callings: So reprobation temporall is all one with obduration, as when men are not, through the mercy of God and power of his grace, brought about to obey their calling, but through the hardnesse of their hearts, uncorrected by the spirit of God, they stand out, and refuse to obey when they are called. Now like as it followeth not, that because men are not elect, in respect of Election temporall, untill they obey their calling, therefore God did consider them as obedient to their calling before hee elected them unto life: In like sort it followeth not, that because men are not reprobate in respect of reprobation temporall, untill they are found to disobey their calling; *Ergo*, God did consider them as disobedient to their calling before he reprobated them unto death: albeit there is a vast difference between Election and Reprobation. For if once men be found truly to obey their calling, hereby as they are effectually called, so they may be assured of their eternall Election unto grace, and consequently unto glory also. But although men for a while are found to disobey their calling, though hereby they are obdured, yet no evidence ariseth here-hence of their non-election unto grace, and consequently of their reprobation from grace, and as from grace so from glory also. The reason is, because nothing but finall obduration and continuance in sinne is an evidence of Reprobation eternall; though in this case they may be accounted reprobate two wayes: First in a negative opposition to Election temporall; for certainly in this case they are not as yet effectually called, that is, converted unto God. Secondly, they may be called reprobate as it hath the signification of an adjective, and not of a participle; like as *ἐκλεκτός* is sometimes used in holy scripture, *1 Pet. 2. 9. Revel. 17. 14. 2 Job. 1. 14.* And the word Reprobate in those places you take advantage of, is rather an adjective then a participle. As for Reprobation in opposition to Election eternall, that is expressed in holy Scripture by the not writing mens names in the book of life: which signifies Gods purpose to deny them both grace and glory; and they are commonly stiled ἀπολλόμενοι rendered, such as perish; *1 Cor. 1. 18. and 2 Cor. 4. 3.* And on the contrary, the Elect are called σωζόμενοι, *1 Cor. 1. 18. But unto*

Of Gods decree of Ordination to Wrath.

111

us which are saved, it is the power of God. And *Act. 2. last v. God added daily to the Church, τὸς σωζομένους*. But then, whereas by consequent followeth their continuance in sinne and condemnation, there is also in scripture a decree of God called Ordination unto wrath, *1 Thes. 5. 9*. And as there is a preparing [*κατάπνομος*] unto destruction, and a creating unto an evill day; so there must consequently be acknowledged in God a purpose to prepare to destruction, and to create against the day of evill. But let us come to the particular scanning of your discourse.

I willingly acknowledge that (as you say) wee no where read in scripture of Reprobation, but of such men to whom the meanes of grace, or at least of the knowledge of God in some measure or other hath been offered in vaine. This qualification is brought in to prevent an exception out of *Rom. 1*. Where the *Gentiles* are said to be given over into a reprobate minde; who yet had not the meanes of grace: But they had (you will say) the knowledge of God in some measure; you meane, the meanes of the knowledge of God, and these meanes are the world, wherein they are brought forth; for the world contains the workes of God, and by them are manifested the invisible things of God, even his eternall power and Godhead. And indeed these meanes of the knowledge of God, all enjoy in equall measure, according to the proportion of the time of their lives. But, to discover unto you the loosenesse of this your discourse, I pray you consider, the sinne of the *Gentiles* here taxed, is *the transforming of the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things*; contrary unto that knowledge which they did or might attaine unto by Gods-workes. Their judgement was their giving over into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient, as there it followeth. And doe you thinke indeed, that all such Idolaters were given over into a reprobate minde to doe such abominable things, as after are mentioned? Were there not found many morall men among the Heathens, which yet were reprobates as well as the most prophane amongst them? Nay, what thinke you of them, amongst whom this sinne of transforming the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things, was not found; as *Varro* writes of the *Romans*, that for above an hundred yeares they had no Images, and that in those dayes the Gods were worshipped more chastely; and that they who brought in

R

Images

Finall continuance in sinne an e-vidence of Reprobation.

is taken as all one with vocation, in proportion whereunto wee must distinguish of reprobation. And like as Election temporall is all one with effectuall vocation, as when men find mercy at the hands of God to obey their callings: So reprobation temporall is all one with obduration, as when men are not, through the mercy of God and power of his grace, brought about to obey their calling, but through the hardnesse of their hearts, uncorrected by the spirit of God, they stand out, and refuse to obey when they are called. Now like as it followeth not, that because men are not elect, in respect of Election temporall, untill they obey their calling, therefore God did consider them as obedient to their calling before hee elected them unto life: In like sort it followeth not, that because men are not reprobate in respect of reprobation temporall, untill they are found to disobey their calling; *Ergo*, God did consider them as disobedient to their calling before he reprobated them unto death: albeit there is a vast difference between Election and Reprobation. For if once men be found truly to obey their calling, hereby as they are effectually called, so they may be assured of their eternall Election unto grace, and consequently unto glory also. But although men for a while are found to disobey their calling, though hereby they are obdured, yet no evidence ariseth here-hence of their non-election unto grace, and consequently of their reprobation from grace, and as from grace so from glory also. The reason is, because nothing but finall obduration and continuance in sinne is an evidence of Reprobation eternall; though in this case they may be accounted reprobate two wayes: First in a negative opposition to Election temporall; for certainly in this case they are not as yet effectually called, that is, converted unto God. Secondly, they may be called reprobate as it hath the signification of an adjective, and not of a participle; like as *κακηλο*; is sometimes used in holy scripture; *1 Pet. 2. 9. Revel. 17. 14. 2 Joh. 1. 14.* And the word Reprobate in those places you take advantage of, is rather an adjective then a participle. As for Reprobation in opposition to Election eternall, that is expressed in holy Scripture by the not writing mens names in the book of life: which signifies Gods purpose to deny them both grace and glory; and they are commonly stiled *ἀπολλομέναι* rendered, such as perish; *1 Cor. 1. 18.* and *2 Cor. 4. 3.* And on the contrary, the Elect are called *σωζόμενοι*, *1 Cor. 1. 18.* But unto

Of Gods decree of Ordination to wrath.

121

us which are saved, it is the power of God. And *Act. 2. last v. God added daily to the Church, τῶς ἐκκλησίᾳς*. But then, whereas by consequent followeth their continuance in sinne and condemnation, there is also in scripture a decree of God called Ordination unto wrath, *1 Thes. 5. 9*. And as there is a preparing [κατάπλις-μος] unto destruction, and a creating unto an evill day; so there must consequently be acknowledged in God a purpose to prepare to destruction, and to create against the day of evill. But let us come to the particular scanning of your discourse.

I willingly acknowledge that (as you say) wee no where read in scripture of Reprobation, but of such men to whom the meanes of grace, or at least of the knowledge of God in some measure or other hath been offered in vaine. This qualification is brought in to prevent an exception out of *Rom. 1*. Where the *Gentiles* are said to be given over into a reprobate minde; who yet had not the meanes of grace: But they had (you will say) the knowledge of God in some measure; you meane, the meanes of the knowledge of God, and these meanes are the world, wherein they are brought forth; for the world contains the workes of God, and by them are manifested the invisible things of God, even his eternall power and Godhead. And indeed these meanes of the knowledge of God, all enjoy in equall measure, according to the proportion of the time of their lives. But, to discover unto you the loosenesse of this your discourse, I pray you consider, the sinne of the *Gentiles* here taxed, is *the transforming of the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things*; contrary unto that knowledge which they did or might attaine unto by Gods workes. Their judgement was their giving over into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient, as there it followeth. And doe you thinke indeed, that all such Idolaters were given over into a reprobate minde to doe such abominable things, as after are mentioned? Were there not found many morall men among the Heathens, which yet were reprobates as well as the most prophane amongst them? Nay, what thinke you of them, amongst whom this sinne of transforming the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things, was not found; as *Varro* writes of the *Romans*, that for above an hundred yeares they had no Images, and that in those dayes the Gods were worshipped more chastely; and that they who brought in

R

Images

The elect for a time may be given to a reprobate minde.

Images were to blame in two respects: First, because *errorem auxerunt*. The Second, because *timorem ademerunt*: and were not they, thinke you, given over into a reprobate minde? Lastly, be it so they were given over, are you indeed perswaded that none of these were the elect of God? Doth not the contrary appeare manifestly in the Corinthians? For, were not they, as well as others, in former time *carried away after dumbe Idols, as they were led*? 1 Cor. 12. 2. Were not they also given over into a reprobate minde? Were not they fornicatours, idolaters, adulterers, wantons, buggerers, &c? 1 Cor. 6. 9, 11. Yet they were *sanctified* in due time; notwithstanding all this, they were *justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God*. Therefore I conclude, it is one thing to be a reprobate in that sense wee here speak of reprobates; for wee speak of reprobates in opposition to Gods elect. But undoubtedly the very elect of God may be for a time, and that for a long time, given over into a reprobate minde. Againe, is Reprobation onely of those to whom the meanes of grace have been offered in vaine? and is Reprobation pronounced on none but such? Then, belike, Reprobation is not eternall, but temporall; and consequently, nothing pertinent to our present purpose: And I could wish you had expressed wherein this Reprobation temporall, which is pronounc't upon men after the meanes of grace have been offered unto them in vaine, doth consist. For, to use words signifying wee know not what, maketh all our disputation as much in vaine, as to draw water with a bucket that hath no bottome. Sure I am, noe receiving of the meanes of grace in vaine is an evidence of that Reprobation wee speak of, unlesse it be finall, though well it may be of giving over into a reprobate minde for the present. But devise what you will to be the act of Reprobation temporall you speak of, will it therefore follow that the consideration of this contumacie in standing out against the meanes of grace, was with God before his purpose thus to reprobate? As for example, because finall impenitency and infidelity go before condemnation, will you herence infer, that the consideration of finall impenitencie and infidelitie did precede Gods purpose of condemnation? By the same course you may conclude, that because faith, and repentance, and good works, and perseverance in all this, goes before a mans salvation, therefore the consideration of all these was precedent to Gods purpose of salva-

salvation. And indeed it cannot be avoided, but that this doctrine of yours in the point of Reprobation, must necessarily overthrow your owne doctrine concerning Gods election; though this is little considered usually. And how can God know mans finall impenitency, unlesse he purpose to permit it? And if the permission of finall impenitency be in Gods intention before condemnation, then, by your owne rules, it must be after it in execution; and so men shall be condemned for their impenitency before they have committed it. It is true, the *Jewes* are pronounced reprobate silver, *Jerem. 6. 30.* after the Prophets labour was found in vaine; but you do not well to extend this unto Reprobation in that sense wee speake of it: For, in your owne opinion, nothing but finall obstinacie doth make men reprobate; but such was not as yet the obstinacie of those *Jewes*, who are there called reprobate silver. And how uncharitable a thing were it for you, or any man, to thinke that none of those obstinate *Jewes* were afterwards converted unto God by the ministerie of the Prophet *Jeremiah*. Yet, admit it were finall, such I confesse precedes condemnation which is temporall: But will you herence inferre it precedes also Reprobation, or the decree of condemnation, which is eternall? But there is no tolerable good consequence in this; and you might as well inferre, that good workes are precedent to election, as I have already shewed. And withall, hereby you should constitute a very wild order of things in execution: Yet, I grant, every obstinacie, so long as men continue in it, making a shew of godlinesse, is sufficient to constitute them reprobate silver, and such as are given over into a reprobate minde. Were it so, that after God hath used meanes to purge the people, and they would not be purged, then hee rejects all further care of purging them from their filthinesse any more: will you inferre thence, that the consideration of this contempt of the meanes of grace goes before Reprobation, as it signifies the decree of condemnation? And consider you not, that thus the permission of this obstinacie in Gods intention, must goe before condemnation, and consequently must follow after it in execution? That is, men shall first be condemned, and afterwards suffered to despise the meanes of grace. Again, doth not faith, and repentance, and good workes, in like manner precede salvation? And must not the consideration of all these by like reason goe before Election? Besides all this, it is an untruth which you

No mans conversion is to be despaired of,

deliver; that after men have refused to be purged when God would have purged them, forthwith hee gives off all further care of purging them from their filthinesse. How many thousands are there in this Kingdome, who are guiltie, and for many yeares have been guiltie, of refusing to be purged when God would have purged them: yet doth not God give over all further care of purging them from their filthinesse? and who dares say, that none of them shall be converted unto God ere they die? Doth not *Paul* warne *Timothie* to carry himselfe gently towards them that are without, waiting *à nous*, if at length God will give them repentance, &c? And why should wee despaire of any, so long as God suffers them to live, and enjoy the meanes of grace? Neither doth the Prophet *Ezech.* 24. 13. expresse or signifie, that God in this case gives over all further care of purging their filthinesse, onely professeth that hee will not spare them any longer: *They should not be purged, till he had caused his wrath to light upon them.* But might not some of them be purged from their filthines after this? And might not the lighting of Gods wrath upon them be a meanes of this? Nay, is not this Gods ordinarie course, when his word is received in vaine, to exercise his people with affliction, and that to this end, even to purge away their drosse till it be pure, and take away all their tinne? *Isai.* 1. And did not the Lord promise as much by the mouth of *Ezechiel* also, and that in reference to the very same wrath of God, as a meanes of their reformation? What else meaneth that, *I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the Countries, and will consume thy filthinesse out of thee?* *Ezek.* 22. 15. Your second question is of the very same nature, and admits in every particular the very same answer.

From the old Testament you come unto the new: That of the Apostle, *2 Cor.* 13. 5. you straine miserable to make it serve your turne. For first you serve your turne at pleasure in the word *ἀδόκιμος*, which is merely the privation of *δόκιμος*, yet you inforce it to signifie a desperate condition, which is utterly repugnant to the genius of the Apostles text: who admonisheth them to prove themselves, whether they were in the faith, to humble them if they found themselves otherwise; not to preach desperation unto them. Neither doth the Apostle inferre the condition of reprobates (such as there hee speakes of) from the receiving of the grace of God by a powerfull ministerie (such as *Pauls* was) offered unto them

them in vaine; but from the not having Christ in them. In this case, whatsoever their minister was, and how little time soever, as well as how long they had enjoyed the Gospel, hee pronounced them reprobates: As, indeed, till men are effectually called, there is noe necessitie that there should be any difference between the Elect and Reprobates considered in themselves: Albeit in respect of the different purposes of God towards them, there is a very great difference. That out of the 1. to the *Rom.* as concerning the *Gentiles* given up to a reprobate minde, I have already spoken sufficient. I like *Piscators* interpretation of *eis adōximon vōv* better then yours: Hee renders it thus, *in mentem omnis judicii expertem*. And I pray tell me, doe you not thinke they were given over *eis adōximon vōv*, before their transforming of the glory of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of corruptible things? Were it not so, how could they have been guiltie of so foule a transformation? It is true, hee gave them up also to a reprobate minde, to doe things uncomely, and to corrupt their lives also with horrible uncleannesse. Yet, I have shewed out of *1 Cor. 6.* that some of those were afterwards sanctified, and consequently *ab origine* the elect of God, and not reprobates in such a sense as we entreat of it in this controversie.

Be it so, that men are not shut up in enmitie against Christ till they have the light: For, how could it be otherwise, seeing to be an encmie to the light, and to hate the light, are but one thing, though expressed under different phrases. What is this to the purpose? Say they are not condemned till then; I say nor then neither; 1. Unless they continue finally therein: for were not the very Elect sometimes strangers and enemies? *Rom. 5. 10. Col. 1. 12.* Be it so, hatred of the light goeth before condemnation, therefore the consideration of this hatred goes before Gods purpose to condemne them. If this Logick likes you, like this also: Faith, repentance, and good workes, goe before salvation; therefore they are before Gods purpose to save them whom he saves. But, whereas you seeme to denote, that after a certaine continuance in hatred of the light, a mans case is desperate, which you seeme to signifie by a phrase of shutting up; besides that it is nothing at all to the present purpose, but matter of another question, I shall beleieve it, when I finde your selfe, or any man else, to prove it: In the meane time I continue as I am, and rest contented with the

reasons formerly mentioned for the disproving of it. Undoubtedly, by the seed of the serpent, cannot be meant all men fallen and corrupted in *Adam* by originall sinne, for they are expressly proposed in opposition to the seed of the woman: *Gen. 3. 15.* Herein I concurre with you, but I concurre not with you in the description of the seed of the serpent; for that agrees to all, even to the Elect, as well as to the Reprobate: before the time comes, that God hath appointed for their effectuall calling; for till then, they have the Image of the old serpent (as you call it) stamped upon them: for they are in blindness of minde and hardness of heart, which undoubtedly are the chiefe workes of the devill, which Christ came into the world to loose. Their will is to doe the lusts of the devill, for the devill workes in them, and being taken in his snare, they are led captive by him to doe his will; yea *Paul* himselfe had an hatred of the light, and loved darknesse above it. But assure your selfe, no hatred of the light, except it be finall, is the cause why our Saviour shuts any man under condemnation. *I verily thought with my selfe (saith St. Paul) that I ought to doe many contrary things against the name of Iesus of Nazareth. 10. Which things I also did in Jerusalem; for many of the Saints did I shut up in prison, having received authoritie from the chiefe Priests, and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. 11. And I punished them oft in every synagoge, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange Cities.* I see no reason why the prophaneness of *Esaus* should stand in greater opposition unto grace, then the zeale of *Paul* while he was a persecuter. *Esau* intreated *Jacob* kindly in his returne from *Mesopotamia*, but *Esau* continued finally in his prophaneness. *Paul* continued not in the course of his blind persecuting zeale; and this puts the true difference between them. Though with God there was a difference put between them from everlasting in his counsels, to make the one a vessell of mercy, the other a vessell of wrath. And I see no reason why the reprobates should not be accounted the seed of the serpent from their first conception: not because of their originall pollution (for that is common to them with Gods Elect) but because God doth not purpose to cure it in them, as hee will cure it in the Elect; though this naturall corruption cannot break forth into actuall hatred of the truth, till they were brought acquainted with

A.A. 26. 9.

with it: and the like actuall hatred breakes forth also in Gods Elect, as it did in *Paul*, untill the time comes which God hath appointed for the curing of it: But hee will never cure it in the Reprobate.

Against the point I know nothing of worth, besides that in the Rom. interpreted and opened in the answer to the fourth Doubt following; save onely that place in Jude, where it is said of the false teachers (as it is commonly translated) that they were ordained of old to condemnation. The words in the originall are; *πάσαι ἀπογεγραμμέναι ἐς αἰῶνα ἰὸ χρίμα*. The sense whereof is given to be, that these false teachers were of old ordained to judgement. viz. As they take it from eternitie, and so before themselves were, or had given any former cause of such condemnation: and according to this sense, the subject whereabouts the decree of reprobation is conversant, is not the world as fallen in Adam, much lesse as fallen from Christ: but as considered in *massa pura*, before they had done good or evil, yea, before they were. To cleare this objection I am to crave leave to depart from the usuall translation and interpretation of this place. For first, *χρίμα* doth not in the first place signifie condemnation, but, as you well know, judgement rather. And so if I should give the sense, they were of old ordained to judgement, viz. according to their workes; this would not at all touch the second act of positive Reprobation, the point now in hand; but only confirme the first point touching the former act. of positive Retribution, spoken of before; viz. before the world was, God then ordained the men of this world to judgment according to their workes. And surely I should have rested in this sense, but that I see the Apostle Jude interpreting the Pronoun *αὐτοῖς*, ἐς αἰῶνα ἰὸ χρίμα, doth thereby point at some spirituall kind of *χρίμα*, or judgement spoken of by him in the wordes before. v. 3. Hee thought it needfull to exhort them to contend earnestly for the faith once given to the Saints. In the v. 4. Hee rendreth a just reason hereof from the antagonists which were crept in amongst them; and whom God himselfe, as the chiefe *ἀγωνιστῆς*, had designed and sent amongst them, to put them to this contention and tryall. For so the coherence requires this word *χρίμα* to be here translated; for *χρίμα* coming of *χρίω*, which signifies decerno, dimico, to contend in law or warre; and then judico, and last of all condemno; doth first signifie
lis.

Ans. v.

lis or certamen, contention or tryall; and then judgement, and at the last hand condemnation. Thus, Paul takes this word in the first sense with Jude here, *κρίματα* for suits or tryalls, or contentions. There is utterly (*saith hee*) a fault amongst you, *ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε ἀλλήλων*, in that you have contentions, or suits, or tryalls, one with another. If you take the primitive sense of the word *κρίμα*, and also consider the coherence of the Apostles words in this place, this will appeare to bee his native and true meaning; *οἱ παλαιοὶ προεργασμένοι ἐς ἔθλο το κρίμα*, who were of old designed to this contention: Yet for a little further clearing of the text, let me adde a word touching the sense of the other two words; *προεργασμένοι οἱ παλαιοί*. In the word *προεργασμένοι* the Apostle alludeth to the common course of Judges, and suites in the law; or of wrestlings in the Olympian, or of captaines in the war, who were wont conscribere, to designe afore-hand, or set downe in writing the names of such adversaries as were to have their causes or tryalls tryed before them. And as for *παλαιοί*, which signifies of old, I dare not stretch it so farre, as to reach it to eternitie; neither doth the place require it, nor any other in scripture to my remembrance. Yea, God himselfe, in Jeremy, plainly distinguisheth time of old, from eternitie; as the lesser from the greater. If you then aske what is that old time Jude here speaks of, wherein God wrought afore-hand, and as it were designed; viz. these false teachers to the tryall of his Church, and contention with him: I answer, About 4040. yeares before Jude wrote this Epistle, when God pronounced in Paradise that ancient curse upon the serpent and his seed, I will put enmitie (*saith he*) between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, then was that of old, when God did assigne and appoint these false teachers under these generall words, the seed of the serpent, to this enmitie, and contention with the Church, concerning the faith once given to the Saints. And indeed the description which Jude gives of these false teachers, thus set out by God unto this contention, doth plainly decipher them as the seed of the serpent; *ἀσεβῆς*, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into wantonnesse, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus have I declared how farre, or rather how little I have departed, and upon what grounds, not so much from the received doctrine of our Church, as the received manner of the expli-

cation

cation of it. In all which I humbly submit my spirit, not only to the judgment of the reformed Churches, whether of England, or of foreigne countries (if ever they come to take notice hereof) but also of every learned godly brother, into whose hands this discourse may fall.

As for that place of *Iude*, *οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι ἐς τὸ τοῦτο* *Examin.*
κριμα, the sense hereof (you say) is given to be, that these false teachers were of old ordained to judgement: viz. As they take it from eternitie, and so before themselves were, and had given any former cause of such condemnation. This you make the interpretation of the place given by others, and their doctrine accordingly: And the consequent thereof you make to be this; namely, That according to this sense, the subject whereabout the decree of Reprobation is conversant, is not the world as fallen in Adam, much lesse as fallen from Christ, but as considered in *massa pura*, before they had done good or evil, yea, before they were. Now I have diverse things to object against you in this. First, were I of your opinion in the point of Reprobation, I should utterly deny that there is any such consequent, that may be lawfully inferred from the former interpretation and doctrine: For, albeit men are from eternitie ordained to condemnation, and consequently before themselves were, or had given any former cause of such condemnation: yet, if when God did ordaine them hereunto, he did foresee, not only their fall in Adam, but their finall infidelitie and impenitency also, and thereupon did proceed to ordaine them to condemnation, as it is acknowledged on all hands at this day; both Papists, Arminians, and orthodox Protestants, your selfe onely (that I know) excepted: then surely hereence it will not follow, that *massa pura* should be the object of Reprobation, but *massa corrupta*; and that not in Adam onely, but with actuall sinnes, and that throughout the whole course of their lives all along, even untill death. And I perswade my selfe, you also will be of the same opinion, if you give your selfe to a due and serious consideration of it; which might have saved you all this paines in straining a poore text to serve your turne in a miserable manner, and that most causelessly: For, certainly you feare in this place, where there is no cause of feare at all on your part. Secondly, why should you straine courtesie to acknowledge Gods ordination (which is no other then Gods decree) of men unto condemnation, to have been
 S from

Iude 4. examined and discus'd.

from all eternitie? For, what Papist, Arminian, Lutheran, or orthodox Protestant (provided that he be learned withall) is found to deny this? Was it not one of the prodigious doctrines of *Vorstinus*, to maintaine that Gods decrees are not eternall? whence it should manifestly follow, that God is changeable. For, if God should now begin to will that, which formerly hee willed not; this would introduce a change in God, as well as if hee should cease to will that which formerly hee willed. Can it be denyed, but that God did everlastingly foresee whatsoever should come to passe? If hee did, then he did from everlasting foresee the small infidelitie and impenitency of every one that in such a condition departs out of the world. And why then should it not become God from everlasting to ordaine all such unto condemnation? Thirdly, who are they that interpret St. *Iude* in such a manner as you obtrude upon them? I cannot beleve any is found so absurd. What? that *καταγογγυσμένοι εἰς τὸ τοῦ χρίστου* should signifie no more then ordaine to judgement! What shall become of *τὸ τοῦ* then? a word in this place most significant? I perswade my selfe you cannot name one, the Author of so loose an interpretation. But let us consider how you carry your selfe in the clearing of it as you speak, which indeed is to raise a mist rather in the clear. *χρίστου* you say, in the first place signifies judgement; and, I say, neither doe they render it otherwise whom you undertake to confute. Yet, holding the translation here (as it were at bay without specification) it cannot stand with your interpretation; to wit, of Gods ordaining men to judgement (in generall) according to their workes: a judgement of mercy, in case their workes prove good; or of wrath, in case they prove evill, whatsoever you pretend to the contrary, but most improvidently. For, albeit the word judgement be generall, and indifferently applicable to either kind, yet, the Apostles phrase here, *this judgement*, *τὸ τοῦ χρίστου*, cannot be understood, and maintained in any such generalitie and indifferencie. And therefore you could not rest in this sense without much oversight as your selfe observe, and forthwith confesse. Therefore you proceed further to observe, that the Apostle v. 3. *though it needfull to exhort them, to contend earnestly for the faith once given to the Saints.* That is true. In the v. 4. hee addes the reason hereof; that also is true in these words: *For there are certaine men creeping in, of old ordained by τὸ τοῦ χρίστου.* And these men

men you call Antagonists, hawking thereby after some congruities to your interpretation following. And thirdly, you observe, that God designed them to somewhat: and the better to hold up the congruities of your interpretation, you call God the chiefe *ἀγωνιστής*. And the thing whereunto God designed them, was (you say) to put the Christians, to whom the Apostle writes, to this contention and tryall: Where you leave the Greek, as no longer able to serve your turne; for it is not *ἀγων*, but *χρίμα*, whereunto God ordained them. But yet (which is enough) you positively avouch that the coherence requires this word *χρίμα* to bee so translated. This, I say, were enough if you could as substantially prove it, as you doe confidently avouch it. And yet I presume, you well know your selfe to have been the first that hath discovered any such pregnancie of the text; to goe as it were with child with any such sense and meaning. And therefore it behooves you to bring good cardes for the prooffe of this your interpretation. Now before I come to examine your prooffe, I say, that this interpretation of yours is farre more rash than that is which you impugne, by how much it is farre more rash (as *Arminius* urgeth against Mr. *Perkins* according unto truth) to say, that God from eternitie ordaines a man unto sinne, then, that from eternitie hee ordaines men unto condemnation: And *Piscator* concurrerth with you in the issue, though he takes a different way. *Ad hoc iudicium*, *ut* *18^o* *Id* *χρίμα*, *i. e.* (saith hee) *ad hanc impietatem, qua impietate committuntur, sibiq; accersunt iudicium Dei, i. e. eternam condemnationem*: As much as to say, to this impietie, which is their condemnation; according to that of our Saviour, *Joh. 3. 16.* This is the condemnation of the world, that light is come into the world, and men loved darknesse rather then light, because their deeds were evill; still holding the word *χρίμα* to his usuall signification of judgement or condemnation. Now wee come to the consideration of your prooffe: *χρίμα* wee know, comes from *χρίω*, which signifies, you say, first *decerno*, then *judico*, and last of all *condemno*. Be it so, hence you inferre, that *χρίμα* doth first signifie *lis* or *certamen*, and then *judgement*, and at the last, *condemnation*; and thus *Jude* takes it here. If this were granted you, then *Jude*s meaning must be this, *who were of old ordained to this contention*: But you render it in much different manner, thus; *Who were of old ordained to put them (good Christians) to this*

Iude 4. examined and discus'd.

contention. Something you plead for the libertie you take in tempering the word, but you doe not so much as endeavour to iustifie the libertie you take in interpreting *Pauls* phrase, when you say, that to ordaine men to this contention, is, to ordaine them to put Christians to this contention. If you should diswade men from impatience, and, giving a reason hereof, should say, *For many wicked men there are of old ordained to this impatience*; would any of your Auditors understand you? But give we you leave to enjoy your interpretation of the phrase, let us see how you can iustifie your interpretation of the word. The first reason is, *ab origine nominis*; as if the verbe *xpiva*, did first signifie to contend, and thence you inferre that *xpiva* signifies contention in the first place. But you bring no Greeke Grammarian or Dictionarie to iustifie either the one or the other; neither doe I thinke any world of words (as Dictionaries are sometimes called) doth iustifie any such interpretation of *xpiva* or *xpiva*. A matter may be determined by deeds (as by dint of sword) as well as by words, and legall debates; so that *judicare* and *discernere*, as comprehended under *xpiva*, shall be still of the same moment, and nothing different in the effect, though *res* prove to be *judicata* different wayes. Secondly you say, that St. *Paul* takes the word *xpiva*, for contentions: I finde by my Concordance that the word *xpiva* is found 28. times in the new Testament. Out of all these you have pickt out one to serve your turne, if that doth serve your turne; 1 Cor. 6. 7. *There is utterly (saith he) a fault among you; ἐν ὑμῖν κρίσις καὶ ἔρις*, that is, say you, in that you have contentions and suits or tryalls one with another. *Calvin* renders it thus, *¶ Jam quidem omnino delictum in vobis est, quod judicia habetis inter vos*; keeping the word to his usuall signification: you will have it to signifie contention, as if by speciall providence it were here so used. For the better clearing of St. *Jude*, our English, both the last, and Geneva, thus: *Now there is verily a fault among you, that you goe to law one with another.* Now to goe to law, what is it but to seeke to civill courts for judgement or justice. Yet I am content to take your owne translation, whereby it is apparent, that by this word, is not so much signified contentions in generall, as suites and tryalls in speciall; like as *Piscator*. renders *xpiva* in this place, *controversias forenses*, to wit, by a Metonymie of the effect for the cause; for, where there are judgements foren-

secall,

secall, there must needs proceed controversies forinsecall. And as for contentions in generall, I doubt not but you well know, that in the new Testament they are usually denoted under the words *ἔρις* or *ἔρις*. Now compare wee this with that of *Iude*, when the Apostle exhorts them, *v. 3. to contend* (under the word *ἔρις*) *for the faith once given to the Saints*, and that against those seducers and corrupters, the devills factors no doubt, who goeth about like a roaring Lion, seeking whom he may devour: he doth nothing at all exhort them to such contentions as you call suits or tryalls, but rather unto a contention of resistance unto the practice of such who would corrupt them; of the same nature with the exhortation of *Peter*, *1 Pet. 8. 5.* Having told them of the devills going about like a roaring lion, &c. *Whom resist* (saith he) *steadfast in the faith*: And answerable to that of *Paul*, *Ephes. 6. 12. Wee wraسته not against flesh and bloud, but against principalities, and against powers, and against worldly governours, &c. For this cause take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to resist in the evill day; and having finished all things, to stand.* So that throughout, there is nothing at all that serves your turne for the countenancing of so strained an exposition, which yet (as before I shewed) is most causelessly undertaken. You proceed to a little further clearing of the text, or rather to the raising of more mists, especially in the interpretation of the word *πάλας*. As for the allusion you finde in the word *παροργισαμένοι* to the common course of Judges and suits in the law, or of wrestling in the Olympians, or of Captaines in the warre, who (as you say, but without any prooffe) were wont *conscribe*, to designe beforehand, or set downe in writing the names of such adversaries as were to have their causes or tryalls tryed before them. I have no great edge to oppose it. But *Calvin* goes no further then scripture, to discover unto us this allusion: *Porro* (saith he) *hæc metaphoræ inde sumpta est quod æternum Dei consilium, quo ordinati sunt fideles ad salutem liber vocatur.* And *Revel. 20.* wee read of another booke besides the booke of life, wherein the deeds of wicked men are written, and is not there written (thinke wee) their condemnation also? As for the word *πάλας* of old, I confesse there is no native force therein to extend it to the signification of eternitie: Nay, *Mar. 15. 44.* it is applied to a very little time before; for *Pilate* demands of *Ioseph of Arimathea*, that

Iude 4. examined and discus'd.

came unto him boldly to aske the body of Jesus, *whether he were dead πάλαυ* already; yet it is applyable even to eternitie, neither doth it signifie any definite time rising upwards. And, although this phrase *of old* be distinguished from eternitie, *Jer.* 31. 3. yet it is not *Habac.* 1. 12. And as the words are different in the hebrew, so neither of them is rendred by *πάλαυ* in the greeke: but wee extend not the signification of it to eternitie by any force of the word, but from the matter whereof he treats, which is the ordination and decree of God, which every intelligent and orthodox Divine acknowledgeth to be eternall; and I finde it wondrous strange so worthy a Divine as your selfe should be of any other opinion. And, I pray, why might not this designation be from eternitie, as well as 4040. yeares before, such ungodly men were crept in amongst the people of God? Belike not till then was the divell assigned to be anemie to the woman; for it is expressly said, *God would put enmitie betweene the woman and the serpent, betweene the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent.* Surely, that place onely signifies what Gods eternall purpose was in this particular; then breaking out and manifesting it selfe; not that then the Lord did begin to ordaine it: For, nothing in the nature of God is temporall. And, certainly the enmitie of the serpent against mankinde had broken out before this.

Amongst others, I am one into whose hand this discourse of yours is fallen at length, having heard some inckling of it in the generall before; and truly by accident I lighted upon it, without any enquiring of mine, without any others offering it unto me; and I am sorry to see the scandall and offence that is given thereby unto Gods people in the way of truth: and that as I seeme to have just cause to suspect, some have been hardned and confirmed in their errour; and some, I heare, doe boast of this discourse of yours, as no small credit and reputation to their cause: yet, I am perswaded, this is no judgement of God upon you, who are far from any hereticall animositie: onely we all know but in part, and the best are obnoxious unto errour; but the judgements of God that have their course in these dayes doe astonish me, in giving men over to illusions to believe lies, by what meanes, and after what manner he thinks good; and all because we doe not embrace the truth, the precious truth of God with love, thereby making our selves most unworthy of it. For, when in vouchsafing unto us his holy truth,

Christ to be sought while he may be found.

135

he doth as it were cramme us against our appetite, is it not high time for him to make us fast?

And amongst them of our selves, onely this let me adde; be-
cause, verum & bonum convertuntur, every divine truth is rich
in profitable use: I have been confirmed in this truth, by the holy
usefulnesse thereof to all sorts.

1 To the Elect it maintaineth and cherisheth the freenesse and Use 1.
largenesse of the riches of the grace of God to them, whose salva-
tion he carrieth along in all the wayes of it, not according to their
works, but according to his purpose and grace given them in Christ
before the world was; under whom also are spread the everlasting
armes of Gods almightie power and eternall love to guide and pre-
serve them to his heavenly kingdome; which grace to us is so much
the more magnified, when wee behold the severitie, and yet equitie,
of his justice towards the world of mankind; who though hee love
them as his creatures, yet he dealeth with them according to their
workes, which in the end windeth up in their woefull and just de-
struction.

2 To the carnall Christian, that sinneth of ignorance or hu-
mane frailtie, and not of prophane and wilfull contempt of the
meanes and wayes of grace, this doctrine offereth a serious exhor-
tation to them to seeke after Christ whilst hee may be found, and
earnestly presseth on him those lively and quickning expostulations
of the Prophets, Why will you die, O house of Israel? What
could I have done more for my vineyard, that I have not done?
Turne yee, turne yee, that iniquitie may not be your destruction.

3 To the prophane and malignant dog and swine, that wallow-
eth in sensuall and worldly lusts, and snarleth against the meanes
and wayes of his owne peace, and transpleth the precious ordina-
nces of God under foote; to such this doctrine testifieth to their fa-
ces, that God is just in all that cometh on them, and his way e-
quall: They loved the cursed wayes of sinne, and are fallen into
them; they loved not the wayes of blessing, and therefore are they
farre from them.

4 To the Lutheran and Arminian, who refuse the excellent and
heavenly benefit of the sound and comfortable doctrine of Electi-
on, by reason of some hard saying which they observed in the u-
suall manner of handling the opposite decree of Reprobation; to
them this doctrine removeth such stumbling blocks out of the way,

Efficacious grace Gods free gift.

as have hitherto turned them out of the way of truth and peace.

5.

5 To the cavilling fromward spirit, this doctrine cutteth off all occasions of reviling and slandering the orthodox truth of God, and against them cleareth the equitie of the wayes of God.

6.

6 To all sorts of men, yea, to men and Angels, it ministreth much matter of admiring and adoring the wonderfull riches of Gods grace to Christ the head of the Church, and in him to all the elect his members, the absolute power of his soveraigntie in dealing farre otherwise with the world, the unsearchable depth of his wisdom in the order and end of all his wayes, the unsearchable depth of his patience, bountie and long-suffering towards all men, and manifest equitie of his justice, even to those who abuse his patience and bountie to their owne perdition.

Examin.

I confesse this course of justifying, a tenet, by the usefulness of it, is usually much made of by the Arminians; but I could never brooke it in any. This is a faire way to make a rule of faith unto our selves, and under colour of usefulness, to shape the doctrine of the Gospel after our owne fancies: yet, I am willing to examine what here you deliver also in every particular. 1. As touching the first Use, I finde, you serve your turne with a manifest confusion of the grace of vocation, with the grace of salvation; Thus: God of free grace saves in the one, in justice damnes in the other. But the comparifon you make is nothing congruous; For, it is so carried by you, as if in this dealing of God, the case were alike with mans dealing; as when a Judge amongst many malefactors, equally guiltie of death, saves some, and damnes others. These are nothing equall; for the one die in faith and repentance, the other die void of faith, and in the state of impenitency. Therefore to help this incongruities, you will be driven to fly to effectuell vocation: And indeed, before God doth effectually call some by such a grace as he denies others, they whom hee calls were no better then others. But, let us make way for the truth to appeare in her proper colours, by distinguishing those things which ought to be distinguished, lest wee be found to be in love with our owne errors.

As touching Vocation; 1. we acknowledge with you, and you with us, the freeness of Gods efficacious grace bestowed on some, and denyed to others, and herein magnified; that whereas God might have bestowed it on others, and not on them, he hath bestowed it on them, and not on others; yea, on them who are
but

but few in comparifon, permitting a farre greater multitude of others, and which is efpecially to be confidered, though you are not willing to take notice of it: Like as God hath mercy on fome in giving them this efficacious grace we fpeak of, meereley according to the good pleafure of his owne will; fo he hardens others, denying them the fame grace, and that meereley according to the good pleafure of his owne will. And thus the freeneffe of his grace is magnified towards the elect, by his feveritie and freeneffe of his will in denying it unto others: whereas you fo carry it, as if the freeneffe of his grace to the one, were magnified in refpect of his iuftice toward the world of mankinde, in dealing with them according to their workes; which is a plaufible fpeech, and of common courfe usually admitted, but utterly void of truth. The truth being this: That like as God, in inflicting damnation on men, doth not proceed according to the meer pleafure of his own will, but according to the workes of men; fo, in denying grace efficacious, he doth not proceed according to the workes of men, but meereley according to the good pleafure of his owne will. For, the Apoftle plainly profeffeth in this cafe, that looke how he hath mercie on whom hee will; fo likewise he hardens whom hee will. And to cleare the truth in this point (becaufe as many as vary from the truth of God in this point, are not very prone to heare on this eare) let us confider, that iuftice hath different acceptions. In a common notion it is no otherwife taken then for *iuftitia condecentia*, as the Schoolemen call it. Thus, whatfoever God doth is an act of Gods iuftice, whether it be an act of power, as in making the world out of nothing, or an act of liberalitie, in doing good to the creature without caufe, or an act of mercy in pardoning fin; all thefe are acts of iuftice in this fenfe. The meaning whereof is no more but this: In all thefe actions God doth no other thing then what himfelfe hath lawfull power to doe. In this fenfe it is juft with God, as well to have mercy on whom he will, as to harden whom hee will. And fo your comparifon here made, fhould have no life at all to that purpofe whereunto you accommodate it. For, in this fenfe the iuftice of God fhall equally appeare on both fides: Whereas you make the freeneffe of Gods grace only on the one fide to be magnified the more, by the confideration of his iuftice, which hath courfe on the other. So that to hold up your

T

owne

owne comparison as decently proposed, you must be driven to
 forgoe this common notion of justice, and stick to a more strict
 and peculiar notion thereof; and that is, when God rewards or
 punisheth men according to their workes. Now, I say, that God
 doth not deny efficacious grace to any man, according to his
 workes; which I demonstrate thus: The execution of justice in
 this kinde, doth alwayes proceed according to some law, which
 law is made to man by some superior power; but unto God not
 by any superior power (for hee acknowledgeth no superior pow-
 er), but by his owne will: As for example, Wherefore doth God
 crowne all them with glory who die in faith, and in repentance? To wit, because he hath ordained and made a law, that, *whosoever continueth to the end* (in the state of faith and repentance) *shall be saved*. Again, why doth God damne them to everlasting fire who die in sinne, void of faith, void of repentance? To wit, because God hath ordained and made a law, that, *whosoever believeth not* (provided that he continueth in unbelieve unto the end) *shall be damned*. For, undoubtedly, God could have turned men into nothing, had it so pleased him, and had hee not decreed the contrary; like as hee brought men out of nothing. Now shew me that God hath ordained or made a law, that men found in such or such a condition shall be denyed efficacious grace: if you cannot shew any such ordinance or law of God, then doe not say that God, in denyng grace, proceeds according to mens workes in justice. And, indeed, if any such law could be assigned, it would follow, that in the communicating of grace also God should proceed not according to the good pleasure of his will, but in justice, according to mens workes. Consider a second argument, What is sinne originall, but the spirituall death of the soule? By Regeneration man formerly dead in sinne is revived. Now is it congruous to say, that because man is dead in sinne, therefore it is just with God not to revive him? Because a man is blind, therefore it is just with God not to open his eyes? Or, because he is deafe, therefore it is just with God not to open his eares? Suppose sin were but the sicknesse of the soule, is it congruous to say, that because a man is sicke, therefore it is just with God not to cure him? Whereas it is manifest, that unless a man were first sicke, it were impossible to cure him; unless first blinde or deafe, it were impossible

God saves them onely that die in the state of grace.

139

to restore sight or hearing unto him; unlesse first dead, it were utterly impossible to revive him.

Come wee now to salvation and damnation; you seeme to say that God of his free grace doth save a man. In my judgement it is an improvident speech. For, consider, whom doth God save of ripe yeares? Doth hee save any other but those that die in the Lord? That is, such as die in the state of grace, in the state of faith and repentance? Now judge, I pray, Is it fit to say, It is free and indifferent with God, either to save or damne them who die in the Lord, in the state of grace, in the state of repentance? For, hath not God made as well such a law, that, *whosoever beleeves and repents, he shall be saved?* As such a law, *Whosoever beleeves not, nor repents, shall be damned?* And, in respect of the former law, is not God as much obliged to save them that beleeve and repent, as in respect of the latter law, hee is obliged to damne them that beleeve not, that repent not? So that the comparison is miserably to blame, made between the freenesse of Gods grace in saving the one, and his severitie and justice in condemning others: And the confounding of effectuall vocation and salvation on the one side, and obduration with damnation on the other, hath exposed you to this incongruities ere you are aware. So that, whereas I thought to have least to doe about this use, a greater businesse is made unto me in clearing the truth of God herein then I could imagine: and yet I am not come to an end. This may suffice to discover the unsoundnesse of the maine body of your comparison. But there are some other things to be considered on the by: First, by way of amplifying the largenesse of the riches of the grace of God. You tell us how the Lord carrieth the salvation of his Elect in all the wayes of it, &c. And forthwith by way of addition you say, that *under them also are spread the everlasting armes of Gods power and eternall love, to guide them to his eternall kingdome:* Which is no different thing, but meereley the same with the former, of *carrying their salvation along in all the wayes of it.* These expressions, I confesse, are momentuous, to stir up gracious affections in the apprehension of the freenesse and power of Gods grace. But, if hereby our judgement (in the meane time) is not a little disturbed

in discerning Gods truth, so that wee embrace error in stead thereof, wee shall buy good affections at too deare a rate, as is the losse of truth. And hereby as I have shewed, the freenesse of Gods grace is miserably weakned: For, if God be not acknowledged freely and of the meere pleasure of his will to deny grace unto some, I cannot see how well it can be maintained that hee doth freely and according to the meere pleasure of his owne will bestow it upon others. Again, that phrase of yours, *the equitie of Gods justice* toward them that are damned, seemes somewhat incongruous. For, equitie signifies the moderation of justice in such sort, that the strictnesse thereof may not hinder mans good: But what good the damned reap by this equitie you speak of, you have not declared. Lastly, you say, *God loves the damned as they are his creatures*. And it is a phrase, I confesse, that hath its course with many hand over head. In the very state of damnation in hell fire, they are and still continue to be his creatures; what, I pray, is that love of God that passeth upon them in that state? Undoubtedly, whatsoever it be, it must consist with hatred in the highest degree. I would willingly know whether it be *Amor complacentia*, or *Amor beneficentia*. If it be *complacentia*, what is it that God likes in them, unlesse it be his own worke, the nature of men? Or what good is it that God doth unto them in the state of damnation? Can it be any other then the continuance of their being? Yet, most thinke that is nothing good to them in the state of damnation. Whatsoever your meaning be, if you did expresse it, it may be you would fly from your owne caution in this place, as *Moses* did from his rod when it was turned into a Serpent. I am perswaded, the apparent moongruitie thereof would little please you. I come to the Consideration of the second Use.

2 That the doctrine of our Church, from which you swerve, doth not offer, as well as yours, to carnall Christians a serious exhortation to seeke after Christ whilst he may be found: Or that it doth not, as earnestly as yours, presse upon them those heerie and quickning expostulations of the Prophets: *Why will yee die, O house of Israel? Or, What could I have done more for my vineyard that I have not done? Turne yee, turne yee,*
 that

The description of a carnall Christian examined.

141

that iniquitie may not be your destruction, you doe not so much as goe about to prove. But I have something more to except against this use of yours. The description here given by you of a carnall Christian; to wit, *That hee finnes of ignorance and humane frailtie, and not of prophane and wilfull contempt of the meanes of grace*; I had thought it had been proper to the regenerate, and not at all belonging to the carnall Christians, whom, I thinke, you make no better than naturall men, to whom the things of God are foolishnesse; and in whom *τὸ πρὸνυμα τὰς σαρκὸς* is enmitie unto God, in such sort, that they are not subject unto the law of God, nor can be. But, I presume, you speak this of civill and morall Christians, conforming to the meanes of grace, and not giving any outward evidence of contemning them. But, herehence it followeth not, that God who seeth their hearts; finds not prophanenesse in them, or vile estimation of the meanes of grace. But howsoever, whether they are prophane or formall, wee exhort all, wee presse the same exhortations upon all: and dare you say, that never any prophane or wilfull contemner of the meanes of grace is converted? Though that these exhortations doe quicken any; it is meerely of the spirit of God, *who bloweth where hee listeth*. But, whereas you seeme to imply (though you are not willing to deale plainly, and expresse so much) that a carnall Christian, such as here you have shaped him, hath power to yeeld to these exhortations, and quickning exhortations; a point that we dare not take hold of, without much explication: For, to yeeld unto them in a gracious manner, I conceive, to be utterly out of the sphere of a naturall man, or a carnall Christians activitie: And, I presume, you will affirme as much; but to yeeld unto them, either hypocritically, either according to the course of grosse hypocrisie, or of that hypocrisie which is secret to him that is possessed with it, or, *ad exteriorem vite emendationem*; wee deny not such a power unto a carnall Christian as you describe him, nor unto any prophane person whatsoever. And, I am perswaded, it is onely a consideration of things in generall, and in a confusaneous manner, holds you on to imply such a power in carnall

all Christians: Whereas if things were distinguished aright, it would more easily appeare what is within the region of nature, and what beyond it, as meerey imputable to the speciall grace of God, and operation of his spirit.

3 As for *dogs and swine*, wee are forbidden to *give our holy things, or to cast our pearles before them at all*. And therefore are wee not to trouble our selves, in considering to what end this doctrine is to be preached unto them. And yet, as for the testifications proposed as proper unto them, it is nothing so; for not to them only, but to carnall Christians also doe such belong, yea, to the very Children of God also; to wit, *That God is just in all that cometh on them, and his wayes equall*. As when after *Dauids* foule finnes in the matter of *Uriah*, the sword pursued his house, and *Ab-solon* defiled his fathers concubines, and hee was driven to flie from *Ierusalem*, and *Shimei* meeting him on the way cursed him, &c. And, I pray you, what unregenerate man throughout the world doth not love the cursed wayes of sin, in some kind or other, though not in all kinds? And no marvell, for vice is like a pike in a pond, it devours both vertue and lesser vices: One vice is opposite to another, and not onely unto vertue: And therefore, no mervaile if no man be found vicious in all kinds.

4 As for the *Lutheran* and *Arminian*, you professe, that this Tenet of yours *removes such stumbling blocks out of their way, as have hitherto turned them out of the way of truth and peace*. But what these stumbling blocks are, which you have removed, I know not. It seemes this hath been a chiefe inducement unto you, to decline from that which you confesse to be the most received opinion of our Church, and to shape unto your selfe a new forme of opinion different from that which is received, (if not to remove some stumbling blocks out of your owne way.) Now, if it be so, the fairest course had been to have expressed what these offences are; Secondly, how our most received Tenet doth either cast them in the way of others, or at least doth not remove them; and thirdly, to shew how by this opinion of yours they are removed: But none of these have been performed by you.

Againe,

Again, Mr. *Moulin*, being very orthodox in the point of Election, as you are, varieth from us, as you doe, in the point of Reprobation; maintaining, Reprobation to be instituted upon the foresight of mans finall impenitency, in his *Anatome Arminianismi*. *Corvinus* an Arminian, hath taken him to taske in a worke of his, and is never a whit the more forward to concurre with us in the point of Election, because *Moulin* concurres with them in the point of Reprobation. Nay, what doe Papiists say about *Durham*, by occasion of our complying with them, but this, They need not comply with us, for wee come fast enough forwards to comply with them. And more then this, I have already shewed, that this tempering (or corrupting rather) of the doctrine of Reprobation, maketh a faire way for the utter overthrowing of that which you call *the sound and comfortable doctrine of Election*. Forasmuch, as looke by what reason you maintaine the foresight of finall impenitencie and infidelitie to goe before Reprobation, as it signifies the punishing with everlasting death; by the same reason it will appeare, that the foresight of finall perseverance in faith, repentance, and good workes, must necessarily goe before Election, as it signifies Gods decree of rewarding with everlasting life. In which notion alone, election or the decree of salvation, is contrarily opposite to reprobation, or the decree of condemnation. For, in maintaining that Reprobation, as a purpose of God to condemne for sin, doth presuppose the foresight of sinne, you doe thereby imply that Election, as a purpose of God to reward for righteousness of faith and repentance, doth presuppose the foresight of faith and repentance. But, if your meaning be no other than this, that God hath ordained no man unto damnation but for sinne; what offence or scandall doe you remove hereby, which wee doe not remove also, who concurre with you herein. And, which is more, wee are ready not onely to affirme, but to make good also, that in no moment of nature doth the purpose of Condemnation goe before the foresight of sinne, even of that sinne for which men shall be damned: Whereas you, in maintaining that the foresight of sinne is precedent to the purpose of condemnation, are not able

Gods decree to save precedes not foresight of Faith.

able to make it good; but must necessarily fall foule upon a manifest contradiction to your owne rules: For, if the foresight of sinne be precedent to the decree of condemnation, then God did first decree to permit sinne, before hee did decree to damne for it: And herehence it followeth that permission of sinne in Gods intention, was before condemnation; and if it were first in intention, then, by your owne rules, it must be last in execution; that is, men shall be condemned for sinne, before ever they be permitted to sinne. Nay, I appeale to your owne conscience, whether wee doe not open a fairer way for composition in the point of election, then you doe in the point of Reprobation. Considering that like as in Reprobation, Gods decree to condemne, is in no moment of nature precedent to Gods foresight of sinne; so in Election, I am bold to affirme, that Gods purpose to save is in no moment of nature before his foresight of faith, repentance, and good workes, and finall perseverance in them all. Will not you thinke, that you have cause to feare hereupon, that I am more dissolute in the point of Election, than rigid in the point of Reprobation? Yet if you will confesse, that herein is a faire way opened for composition in the point of Election; I dare undertake to perswade you, that this shall be maintained without any prejudice either to the freeness of Gods grace, or to the absoluteness of his power. The truth is, our Divines have a long time erred in making different decrees of those which are but one (I mean formall) decree, to wit, of the meanes, though materially different, which is nothing strange: For, why should it seeme strange that many meanes should be required to the same end? Wee commonly say, that Gods decree to give salvation is the decree of the end; and his decree to give faith and repentance is the decree of the meanes: yet they dare not say commonly, that Gods decree to inflict damnation is the decree of the end; and Gods decree to deny grace is the decree of the meanes: And so they are driven to overthrow all Analogie between Election and Reprobation. I say that Gods decree of giving faith and salvation unto sinners, are but one formall decree of God concerning the meanes; the end whereof is, the manifesta-

nifestation of Gods glory in the way of mercie mixt with justice. And indeed, nothing can be the end of Gods actions but his owne glory; for hee made all things for himselfe, and as all things are from him, so all things must be for him; for the supreme efficient must be the supreme end. Now if God at once, and in one moment of nature, decreeth to give salvation by way of reward of faith, judge you, or let any indifferent Reader judge, whether this decree of salvation be not necessarily conjunct with the foresight of faith.

5. As for the occasions of slander and reviling the orthodox truth of God, which as you conceive, this doctrine of yours cutteth off to the cavilling and forward spirit; you have not so much as expressed what they are, much lesse justified them, to be such occasions as you speak of, or shewed how they are removed by your doctrine, and not by ours. In like sort, what is that equitie of the wayes of God, the credit of the clearing whereof, you attribute to your owne doctrine, and derogate from ours, you take no paines to explicate. If your meaning be, that you maintaine, that God condemnes no man but for sinne voluntarily and freely committed by him, and withall doe obtrude upon us the contrary, you doe us the greater wrong, provided you speak of men of ripe yeares. As for the damnation of infants, I doubt you feare so much to offend men, that you come too neere the *Pelagian* and *Arminian* tenet hereabouts. And if you thinke there is any active power in a naturall man to believe and repent, wee will not feare offence to resist you, or any man in this; the scripture having so plainly expressed the contradictorie to this; *1 Cor.* 2. 14. and *Rom.* 8. 8. Or, if your opinion be, that God doth not harden whom he will, as well as hee shewes mercie on whom hee will; (where the good pleasure of God is as evidently signified to be the cause of the one, as of the other) wee shall not forbear by Gods grace, through feare of offence, to resist you in this also. And if *Pharaoh* shall hereupon object and say, Why doth God complaine of my not letting *Israel* goe, when he himselfe hardens my heart, that I may not let *Israel* goe; wee

thinke it fit to take the Apostles course to stop such a ones mouth; and say, *O man who art thou that disputest with God, shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me, thus? Hath not the potter power, &c.* And let men take heed, they doe not take upon them to be wiser then the Holy Ghost, and thinke to satisfie men by devises of their owne, when the word of God doth not satisfie them. Yet, in all this, the Apostle doth not impeach the libertie of their wils, nor *Austin* neither, but rather justifieth it throughout; yet is hee bold to pronounce, that *libertas sine gratia, non est libertas sed contumacia*. As much as to say, a man without grace hath will too much to that which is evill, and averse from that which is good, as being wilfully bent to the one, and opposite to the other. And, the providence of God in the efficacie of working all things to his owne ends, compared with the libertie of the creature, hath ever been accounted of a secret nature; whereas now a dayes, nothing will satisfie the Patrons of free will, unlesse this secret and misterious providence of God, as it was wont to be accounted, come to be utterly overthrowen, and libertie of the creature (if not chance) be brought to domineere in the place thereof. When you speak of the orthodox truth of God, I presume, you doe not distinguish of the truth of God as if some were orthodox, and some not. Yet, I confesse, *Epishites* have another use besides the use of distinction; yet, in this case also, the *Epishire* is not congruous, for orthodox is as much in effect as true.

6 As touching the last, I presume, you will not deny, but that the riches of Gods grace to Christ, and in him to all the *Elect*, are by our Tenet acknowledged to be as wonderfull as by yours. As for the absolute power of his soveraigntie in dealing farre otherwise with the world, I presume, your opinion is, that wee doe exceed rather then come short of you in the acknowledging thereof: For, wee maintaine God to be absolute and free, in the denying of grace to some, as in giving it to others. And by denying of grace, wee understand the hardning of men, at least as touching the chiefe part wherein it consists. Yet, this you will have to proceed not

so much according to Gods absolutnesse, as according to his justice in punishing men with obduration; yet, I grant, there is an obduration which is properly enough a punishment of sinne, and when men are thereby prostituted unto danger, and exposed unto destruction. Yet, I dare appeale to the judgement of any intelligent *Arminian*, whether, in case you doe maintaine as you speake, the absolutie power of Gods soveraignie in dealing farre otherwise with the world, then with the elect, any scandall is removed out of their way by your tener which is cast in their way by ours. As for the unsearchable depth of his wisdom, in the order and end of all his wayes, as also of his patience towards all men; I presume, you will not say it is more maintained by your tener then by ours. But by the way, I hope, you will not except against that of *Austin*; *Quantum liber praeberit patientiam nisi Deus dederit, quis aget penitentiam*, cont. *Jul. liber 3. Cap. 4.* And againe in the same place, *Istorum neminem* (to wit, non praedestinatorum) *adducit Deus ad salubrem spiritualemque penitentiam, quam homo reconciliatur Deo in Christo, siue ampliorem illis patientiam, siue non impariorem praebeat.* And againe, *adducit ad penitentiam, sed praedestinati adducit*, and none other in his opinion. As for the justice of God to obdurate sinners, I hope you will not say, the common tener of our Divines doth any way infringe it; wee generally maintaine him to be righteous in all his workes, and holy in all his wayes: For, hee punisheth none but for sin; none of ripe yeares, but for sinne voluntarily and freely committed by them, and that in such sort as they might avoide it; speaking of any outward transgression; Onely it is not in their power to change their hearts, and to love God with all their hearts, and feare him, and depend upon him: Whence it cometh to passe, that albeit there is no particular, materiall, transgression, which they could not avoide, yet it is not in the power of a naturall man to avoid it in a gracious manner; and all for want of that love of God, before spoken of, which cannot be wrought in a man, but by the spirit of regeneration. If any man should further object (as I wish you had objected, to the uttermost, against our Tener) sup-

posing a naturall man to performe what good lieth in his power to performe, but not in a gracious manner; and likewise to omit what lieth in his power to omit, but not in a gracious manner, which alone is not in his power to performe; and say, what iustice is there in the damnation of such a man? I answer, as much as in the damnation of an infant for original sinne; considering that by reason of original sin it is, that a naturall man cannot performe any thing in a gracious manner, to wit, for want of the love of God: Original sinne being an habituall aversion from God, and conversion unto the creature, or more briefly an inordinate conversing with the creature, either in enjoying it, whereas hee should onely use it, God alone being to be enjoyed; or in using it, but not in a gracious manner, that is, not for Gods sake; to wit, through want of the love of God, which is brought upon us by the sinne of *Adam*; as whereby our natures were bereaved of the spirit of God. This in prosecuting mine answer unto a deviled argument, I have made bold to open my minde concerning original sinne: A point that hath seemed unto me of such difficultie, that I have been want to range it amongst those three, whereabouts I could not expect to be satisfied whilst I lived. Another was the very point wee have in hand.

To the fourth Doubt.

HOW may it appeare that Gods hatred of *Esau*, is of a lesse degree of love, since the making of him who by birth is superiour, to be a servant to his underling, argueth no good will at all, but: 4th Doubt. Quest. 4.

First, rather a purpose to passe him by, in respect of communicating grace and glory.

Secondly, since the raising of *Pharaoh*, which was to this intent, to shew his power in his overthrow argueth the like.

Thirdly, since hardning is an effect of hatred, and depends on the will of God, as the first cause thereof, even as Mercy doth.

Fourthly, since there is no cause of that objection, why complaines hee? Who hath resisted his will? or at least of that answer, *Rom. 9. 20, 21, 22.*

I Answer, as *Jacob* preferring *Ephraim* the younger brother to greater estate then his elder brother *Manasses* did not thereby declare a positive hatred of *Manasses*, but a lesse degree of love to him in comparison of his brother:

Answer.

So Gods preferring *Jacob* to be a superiour and Lord to his elder brother *Esau*, doth not argue that in him there is no good will at all to *Esau*, but a lesse degree of love.

To subject *Esau*, as a servant to *Jacob*, doth not reprobate *Esau*, but puts him into the condition of the world of mankind: who together with the rest of the Creatures are made to be servants to the Church of the elect, and to the members of it.

But grant Gods hatred of *Esau*, and making him a servant to his underling, argueth no lesse then a purpose to passe him by, in respect of communicating glory unto him out of grace. And for my part thus farre I yeeld, that it may well argue a purpose of God to passe by him, in respect of communicating glory to him out of grace, that grace I mean, whereby hee hath made us accepted in his beloved: for this grace or free love, is made *Jacobs* preheminance, and is denyed to *Esau*, and though it put him into the estate of a servant to his elect brother, and so

into the condition of the world of mankind, yet it doth not reprobate him, or argue a purpose to passe him by in respect of communicating life or glory at all unto him, but implyeth only a purpose to deale with him in justice, viz. to give him life or death according to his works, as I have already shewed in the answer to the former doubt, and shall have occasion more fully to declare it, in the end of this.

Exam.

Surely *Jacob* in doing that which hee did to *Manasses* and *Ephraim*, did neither preferre one to a greater estate then the other, or love one lesse then the other. But in the spirit of prophecy fore-signified, what would bee the condition of each in their race and posterity. But suppose a father in that which lyeth in his power, preferres one son before another, and accordingly in that way of *Amor beneficentie*, bee said to love one lesse then another, will any sober man say, that hee loves the one, and hates the other? Is this a decent expression of lesse love? Wee know full well, that a lesse love in the way of beneficence, may bee joyned with a greater love in the way of complacency: As for example, an earthly Father, though hee suffer his eldest son to goe away with the Land, yet hee may bear greater affection to a younger sonne, though hee assigne unto him a farre lesse portion: then to his elder brother. And if it were decent to say, hee hates him, whom hee loves lesse in respect of beneficence; then hee should bee said to hate him whom hee loves best.

Lastly, if the hating of *Esau* bee interpreted lesse loving, why may not the loving of *Jacob*, by the same liberty bee interpreted the lesse hating of him.

Amongst Gods elect some are more beloved of God, and some lesse, according as hee ordaines one to greater grace and glory then another, and is it fit to attribute that to *Esau*, which wee attribute to Gods elect?

I grant that to subject *Esau* to *Jacob* as a servant, is not to reprobate him, for this subjection is made in time; But reprobation, as wee take it in opposition to election, *Ephes. 1.4.* was made before all times. It is your own phrase, to distinguish the world of mankind from the elect, as if the elect were none of the world of mankind. For the very elect themselves are subjected as servants to the elect, every one unto others: though

though as great as *Paul* and *Apollo*, as appeares by the very place, your self have now in a contrary sense alledged more then once. And who doubts that wee must all serve one another through love, since Christ himself was content to wash his Disciples feete? Lastly, the yoke of *Esau* unto *Jacob* was at length shaken off, as appeares by *Isaacs* prophesie it should bee; but the yoke of subjection of all things unto the Church, shall never bee shaken off.

But you perceiue well enough that the discourse which you answer, considered this temporall preferment (which yet had course onely in their seed) onely in a typical manner, as that *which vnder temporall things prefigured spirituell*, and accordingly you proceed to shape your answer thereunto in that respect also. The same is this, *Though God had no purpose to deale with Esau, as hee dealt with Jacob: that is, to communicate glory unto him out of grace, yet hee had a purpose of communicating glory unto him some other way*, and what can that bee, but of communicating glory unto him, not out of grace? A very strange assertion, and therefore no marvell, you spared to set it down in so many words. Onely you say, that the putting him into the state of a servant, did not reprobate him, or argue a purpose to passe him by in respect of communicating life and glory unto him. Which to my judgement doth manifestly intimate that you acknowledge in God a purpose to communicate life and glory to *Esau*, someway or other.

And if you did acknowledge a purpose in God not to communicate life and glory at all unto him, this *Aquinas* confesseth, and wee joyntly with *Aquinas*, confesse that it is nothing lesse then to hate him. For if God will haue a man to bee, and will not haue him to bee saved, surely hee will haue him in the end to bee damned. For in the end there will bee found no middle state, equally remote from salvation and damnation. But you doe in plain termes acknowledge a purpose in God to deale in iustice with *Esau*, and to give him life or death according to his works. I presume you will not avouch this of all them that you account the world of mankinde. For I doubt not but you will except Infants. As for men of ripe years, is it not as true of the elect, as of those you call the men of the world, that they shall bee dealt withall according

Gods judging the World according to

to their workes? I doe not say according to their deserts, but according to their workes, keeping my self to your own phrase. Hath not the Apostle professed, *2 Cor. 5. 10.* That *we must all appeare before the judgement seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that hee hath done, whether it be good or evil?* But these workes I confesse are different, for either they consist in obedience or disobedience; either to the Covenant of the Law, or to the Covenant of Grace; either to the Law of workes, or to a Law of Faith. Now as for those whom you call the world of mankinde, and concerning whom you professe, God hath a purpose to judge them according to their workes. I demand whether your meaning is, God wil judge them according to their workes, in reference to the Covenant of the Law, or in reference to the Covenant of Grace. If in reference to the Covenant of the Law, then the meaning must bee this, God hath a purpose to save them, in case they perform exact obedience to his Law: But in case they continue not in every thing that is written in the book of the Law to doe it, Gods purpose is to condemn them to everlasting death. Now I appeale to every sober Christians judgement, whether if God hath no purpose to save them, but upon condition of such obedience, and withall hath a purpose to damne them upon condition of such disobedience, whether, all things considered, it may not bee more truely avouched, that God hath a purpose to damne them, but no purpose at all to save them. If it bee spoken in reference to the Covenant of Grace, I dispute against it, first in the same manner. The conditions of the Covenant of Grace on mans part being *Faith and Repentance*, if God will not save them, but upon condition of *faith and repentance*; and will damne them in case of *infidelity and impenitency*; then surely if it shall bee found, that the men of this world are far more prone to infidelity and impenitency then unto faith and repentance, it followeth that God purposeth rather to damne them then to save them; But in case they are naturally carryed to infidelity and impenitency, and have no power to beleieve in Christ, and to break off their sinnes by true repentance; then it followeth as well in respect of this Covenant of grace (according whereunto God will deale with them) as in respect of the former Covenant of the Law, that
God

God hath no purpose to save them, but hath a purpose to damne them unto everlasting fire. But so it is of all those whom you call the world of mankind, namely, that they have no power to believe in Christ, or to break off their sinnes by repentance, but are naturally carryed on unto infidelity and impenitency, as I prove thus. They that cannot discern the things of God, but account them foolishnesse, they cannot beleve in Christ: But such are all they whom you call the world of mankind, for I Cor. 2. 14. they are not regenerate, and consequently they are meere naturals. Now *the naturall man*, as the Apostle speaks, *perceives not the things of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him.* Again, all such persons are still in the flesh. Now the affection of the flesh is enmity against God, is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can bee. Secondly, I prove that God cannot deale with them whom you call the world of mankind, according to the Covenant of Grace: For if hee should, hee should save them all; as I prove thus. If whatsoever God requires by this covenant on mans part, God undertakes to perform on his part, then it is impossible but that all must bee saved with whom hee meanes to deale according to this covenant. But whatsoever by this covenant God requires on mans part, God himself undertakes to perform on his part, as I prove thus. First, in generall, God undertakes in this covenant, to bee our Lord and our God, to sanctifie us. Therefore, hee undertakes to give us faith and repentance. Secondly, in speciall, and first, doth God require at our hands, that wee should love him with all our hearts, and with all our soules? God undertakes to perform this. Deut. 30. 6.

I will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy children, that thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soule. Doth God require at our hands that wee feare him? And God also undertakes on his part to work us unto this. Jer. 32. 40. *And I will put my feare into their hearts, that they shall never depart away from mee.* Doth God require Faith? this also on his part hee performes, Act. 2. ult. *God added to the Church daily such as should bee saved:* And Philip. 1. 29. *To you it is given to beleve in him, and to suffer for him.* Doth God require Repentance? *Even to this end God sent his Sonne, to give repentance unto Israel, and forgiveness of sins.* In a word, it is God that

makes us perfect unto every good work to do his will, working in us that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, Heb. 13. 21.

Ans. But in the second place it may bee argued, that Gods raising up of *Pharaoh*, to this intent to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, argueth the like hatred of *Esau* as of *Pharaoh*: viz. a purpose of passing both by, without communicating grace, or glory unto them.

To which I answer, a difference there is between *Esau* and *Pharaoh*; though not in their finall condition, nor in his purpose concerning them: Yet in the degree of their present estate, whereunto they were severally come, when God gave out his severall Oracles concerning them both: for hee saith not of *Pharaoh*, God raised him up to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, before hee had done good or evill, as hee said of *Esau*, that hee should serve *Jacob*, before hee had done good or evill. The Hebrew and Greek word signifie neither to create, nor bring into the world, but to preserve, or to cause to stand, to stirre up, or to advance; which presupposeth *Pharaoh* already born, yea, and of such a Spirit; that if God preserve him and stirre him up, hee was become a fit subject upon whom God might shew his power in his hardning and overthrow. Otherwise God might as well bee said to condemn *Pharaoh* out of his absolute will, without all respect to sin, as to shew his power in hardning of him without all respect to sin.

Hardning, when it falls upon the creature, is both the height of his sin, and depth of his misery, and therefore is it as prejudiciall to Gods justice to inflict it without respect of sin going before, and to the creature as dangerous to undergoe it, as condemnation to hell it self. Hell hath no greater torment then an heart desperately hardned under the wrath, curse, and judgement of God, which was *Pharaohs* case.

But consider *Pharaoh*, not in the estate of *Esau*, as having done neither good nor evill; but in the state wherein he stood, when God gave out his Oracle concerning him, that for this cause hee stirred him up, to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow; and then may I easily grant more then is required. viz. When God purposed to passe by him, not only in communicating grace and glory unto him; but also to fall upon him

him in his utmost wrath, as well in outward strange calamity, as especially in spirituall judgements, hardnesse of heart, and blindnesse of minde to his utter perdition.

In the former part you declined a direct answer to the question proposed; for whereas the question proposed was touching the communicating of grace and glory, you not adventuring to maintaine a purpose of God to communicate grace and glory to them whom you call the world of mankinde, onely maintain a purpose in God (at least you seem so to doe) of communicating life and glory some other way then out of grace. But with what advantage to your cause that hath been carryed, I have already considered. Now you seem to answer the question, looking it directly in the face. For though you acknowledge such a purpose in God concerning *Pharaoh*, to wit, of passing him by in communicating grace and glory, yet the cause (you say) is not alike of *Eſau*, when Gods Oracle was given out concerning him; (hee being not then born) as of *Pharaoh*, when the Oracle, here spoken of, was given out concerning him, hee being then a fit subject, upon whom God might shew his power in his hardning and overthrow. Yet here againe you decline the question: For the question was not, whether *Pharaoh* at that time when God said, *For this cause I have raised thee up, &c.* were a fitter subject for God to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow; then *Eſau* was, while yet hee was in his mothers wombe. But whether God had not a purpose to passe by *Eſau* as touching the communicating of grace and glory, even before hee was born, which hee had concerning *Pharaoh* at that time before spoken of, which that hee had, I prove thus. It was said of *Eſau* before hee was born, that God hated him. What more could bee said of *Pharaoh*, to expresse his alienation from him?

Secondly, look how you qualifie the hatred of God to *Eſau*, in the same manner may it bee qualified towards *Pharaoh*, even at this time you speak of. For Gods hatred towards *Eſau*, you qualifie thus. *God had a purpose to deale with him according to his works*: But say I, even then when God professed of *Pharaoh* saying, *For this cause have I raised thee up, &c.* God had a purpose to deale with him according to his works.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, if therefore God had no such purpose towards *Esau*, (namely, to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow) because *Esau* was not yet born; then belike God had no such purpose towards *Pharaoh* himself, while *Pharaoh* was not yet born. But this is utterly untrue, for as much as Gods purposes are eternall, and not temporall.

And in like manner, it may bee proved, that if ever God had the like purpose towards *Esau*, to wit, after his preferring a messe of pottage before his birthright, or at any other time, it followeth that God had the same purpose towards *Esau*, even before hee was born, for Gods purposes are not temporall, but eternall.

Lastly, as for the difference you put between them, (besides the question) one being a more fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow then the other, I grant it to bee true in part, as touching the hardning of them. For obduration presupposeth a man of such ripenesse of years, as to have the use of reason: But this hinders not, but that God might at the same time have a purpose to harden him in his time, as *Pharaoh* in his time; And yet, why I pray was not *Pharaoh* as fit a subject for God to shew his power in changing his heart, as well as *Saul* was in the midst of his bloody persecutions of the Church of God? And what naturall man (such as I presume are all those whom you call the world of mankinde) is not a fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning and overthrow, though hee bee never so morall, yea as morall as *Trajan*, who raised one persecuti-on, or *Marcus Antoninus Philosophus*, who raised another, or as *Aurelianus*, who raised a third. It is true, if God will move any man unto courses contrary to his corrupt inclination, and not give him grace to master that corrupt inclination; that man whatsoever hee bee, shall bee a fit subject for God to shew his power in his hardning, yea, and overthrow also, if it please him. But if God move any man never so contrarioussly to his corrupt inclination, and withall give him grace to master that corrupt inclination of his, hee shall bee a fit subject for God to shew the power of his grace in his conversion and sal-uation.

You speak much of hardning, even according unto pleasure, without

without giving your Reader any explication of the words, whereby hee might understand your meaning, wherein obduration consists. Surely, obduration is either the denyall of grace, or whatsoever it bee, it is alwaies joyned with the denyall of grace, as I take it. But in very different manner I confesse, which you distinguish not. As for the denyall of grace, that was found to have course in the first sin that was committed both in Angels and men. For I am of *Austins* minde concerning the Angels that stood, that they were *Amplius adiuti* then the other that fell, *De Civit. Dei. lib. 12. cap. 9.* As also concerning *Adams* fall; that in that case, Though God gave him *posse si voluit*, yet hee gave him not *velle quod potuit*, and these hee makes severall *adjutoria*. The like may bee said of every sin that was committed, whereas God could undoubtedly restrain from the committing of it, and that either in a gracious manner, or in a meere naturall manner. When it is committed, his gracious restraint is not afforded, but denyed rather. What that other action is, wherein this obduration consists, and which is joyned with the denyall of grace, you expound not. Suppose it bee Gods moving a man to some course contrary to his corrupt nature, either by his word, as hee moved *Pharaoh* to let *Israel* goe, or by his works, or by the suggestions of conscience; according to that Law which is written in mens hearts, is not this usually found also as often as sinne is committed contrary to light of Nature, or light of Grace? And hath not obduration consequently its course in all this? And why you should pronounce of obduration indefinitely, *That it is both the height of mans sin, and depth of mans misery*, I see no reason. Do not the children of God sometimes feele it, and in patheticall manner complain of it, *Lord why hast thou caused us to erre from thy wayes, and hardened our hearts against thy feare?* *Esay 63. 17.* What saith our Saviour to his Disciples? *Mark 8. 17. Perceive yee not, neither understand, have yee your hearts yet hardened?* As for your phrase of *inflicting obduration*, that doth much require explication, which you doe no where perform that I know. There is I confesse another operation of God besides those I mentioned formerly; whereby men are given over by God, whence it followeth, that they will grow harder and harder, and that is the suspension

of his admonitions, either by taking away his word, or forbearing inward motives by his spirit, or removing his judgements and giving outward prosperity, whereby God is said to *give men over to their own hearts lusts*. But how this or any of these can bee called the *inflicting of obduration*, I understand not. And whereas you say it is prejudiciall to Gods Justice, to shew his power in hardning *Pharaoh* without respect to sin, like as to condemn him; I have already shewed the great difference between condemnation and obduration. It being never said, that God damnes whom hee will, but the Apostle plainly professing that *God hardens whom hee will*, even as expressly as it is said, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will*; and no marvell. For God hath revealed a Law, according to which hee proceeds in damning men, but you are not able to shew us a Law according to which God proceeds in the hardning of them. For if the elect before their callings, bee no better then reprobates, it is impossible to assigne a Law, according to which God proceeds in the hardning of men, but that by the same Law, the Elect of God must bee hardned also. And hardning in the Scripture phrase is usually opposed to Gods shewing mercy. It is one thing to speak of an heart hardned, another to speak of a heart desperately hardned. Yet if you were put to explicate your self, and shew what it is to bee desperately hardned, and that of God, and there withall to prove how *Pharaoh* was at the time you speak of, desperately hardned, I am perswaded this phrase would cost you more pains then you are aware of, for the satisfying of your self, and perhaps somewhat more for the satisfying of others. If then *God purposed to fall upon Pharaoh in his utmost wrath, &c.* Surely, from everlasting hee purposed so to fall upon him: for all Gods purposes are everlasting.

If your meaning bee onely to denote the precedency of such a condition of *Pharaoh* in sin, to Gods falling upon him, in bringing such judgements upon his back; but not a precedency to Gods purpose; I willingly concurre with you herein. But then the like may bee said of God concerning *Esau*, before hee was born, to wit, that God purposed to bring such a measure of obduration and confusion upon him after such a condition of sin. But if your meaning bee (as indeed hitherto

unto

unto the *genius* of your opinion drives you,) namely, that upon the foresight of some sinfull condition, God did decree to bring obduration and condemnation both upon *Eſau* and *Pharaoh*, as this may bee ſaid as well of one as of the other; here you will give us leave to diſſent from you, conſidering how manifeſtly you are found herein to diſſent from your ſelf. For if ſuch a foresight of ſin goe before Gods decree of obduration and condemnation, then God did firſt decree to permit that ſin, before hee did decree to harden and condemne man for it, ſo that the permiſſion of that ſin in Gods intention, muſt bee before obduration and condemnation, and conſequently laſt in execution: that is, men ſhall firſt bee hardened and condemned, and then ſuffered to commit that ſinne, for which they are hardened and condemned.

Again, if Gods purpoſe to puniſh with condemnation, muſt neceſſarily preſuppoſe foresight of ſin in God; by the ſame reaſon Gods purpoſe to reward with ſalvation muſt neceſſarily preſuppoſe a foresight in God of obedience, and in this caſe, what ſhall become of the freeneſſe of Gods grace in election? not to trouble you with the profeſſion of *Aquinas*, that never any man was ſo mad as to introduce a cauſe of predeſtination, *quoad actum predeſtinantis*. The caſe is the ſame with introducing a cauſe of reprobation, *quoad actum reprobanſis*. For the ground of this is, only becauſe there can bee no cauſe of the will of God, *quoad actum volentis*. Now reprobation is well known to bee an act of Gods will, as well as predeſtination.

Answer, But ſay further, that this hardning of *Pharaoh*, bee an effect of the like hatred of *Pharaoh* as of *Eſau*; neither is it ſaid to depend on the ſin of *Pharaoh*, but on the will of God, as mercy doth, as the firſt cauſe thereof.

I anſwer, this hardning of *Pharaoh*, though an effect of Gods hatred of *Pharaoh*, yet it is not an immediate effect of the like hatred hee bare to *Eſau*, before hee had done good or evill, but preſuppoſeth the ſin of *Pharaoh*, viz. his malicious hatred of Gods Church coming between. God hateth no man ſo farre as to harden him, till hee hath fallen into ſome ſin, in which, and for which hee may bee hardened. Hardning being alwaies (as far as I can perceive by Scripture) not only a ſin, and cauſe of ſin, but a puniſhment of ſin.

The hardning of Esau

How can God bee said to punish sin with sin, in hardning the creature, if sin in *Pharaoh* bee not presupposed to goe before the hardning? It is true indeed, this hardning of *Pharaoh* is referred by the Apostle to the will of God as the first cause thereof: For otherwise the answer of the Apostle had not been sufficient to the objection propounded, ver. 14. for there it was objected that unrighteousnesse might seem to bee found in God, even respect of persons to deale so unequally with persons equall, such as *Jacob* and *Esau* were; for if *Jacob* and *Esau* had done neither good, nor evill, when God had exalted the younger to the participation of his free love, and to soveraignty over his Brother, and depressed the elder to the condition of a servant, and as a servant reserved for him just dealing, but not fatherly love; might not this seeme an unequall partiality with God, to deale so unequally with persons equall? To resolve this doubt, the Apostle could not have cleared God from unrighteousnesse by pleading the sin of *Esau*, which deserved that hee should bee so dealt withall, for neither did *Jacobs* sin deserve better; and besides the Apostle had said before, God gave out these Oracles which pronounced his different respect of them without all consideration of good or evill in either of them; viz. before they had done either good or evill. Therefore to satisfie the objection, and cleare Gods righteousness, the Apostle wisely alledgeth testimonie of Scripture, to prove Gods absolute power and ability, to shew mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will to harden.

Exam.

When you say this hardning of *Pharaoh*, though an effect of Gods hatred of *Pharaoh*, yet was not an immediate effect of the like hatred which hee bare to *Esau*, before hee had done good or evill, but presupposeth the sin of *Pharaoh*, your meaning seems to bee this, that it is not at all an effect of the like hatred which hee bare to *Esau*, before hee had done good or evill, yet it is no lesse then the not writing of his name in the book of life, as touching the communicating of saving grace and glory, neither do wee acknowledge it to bee any more; (like as *Aquinas* doth not) now the consequent of this kinde or measure of hatred in holy Scripture is no lesse, then the worshipping of the beast, *Rev.* 13. 8. nothing lesse then the obdura-
tion

tion of *Pharaoh*. The obduration of the children of *Israel*, was no greater then such as was consequent unto this, that *God did not give them an heart to perceive, and eies to see, and ears to heare, Deut. 29. 4.* And this of *not giving hearts to perceive, &c.* undoubtedly, is a consequent even to that hatred which you are content to attribute unto God, concerning *Esau*. But you helpe your self with a complicate proposition, and flie to an immediate effect, which alone you deny in this case, for as much as the hardning of *Pharaoh* (as you say) presupposed sin committed by him, but very improvidently: For if it bee not an immediate effect of the like hatred that God bare unto *Esau*, then in accurate consideration it is to bee acknowledged an effect thereof. Only there is some effect thereof more immediate then this, and what I pray was that? was it *Pharaohs* sin? for of no other doe you make the least intimation; the more improvident is your expression, intimating thereby that *Pharaohs* sin was a more immediate effect in *Pharaoh* of the like hatred God bare to *Esau* then this obduration.

But how doe you prove that *Pharaohs* hardening was not an immediate effect of the like hatred which God bare to *Esau*? to wit, because it presupposed sin. But I deny this Argument, neither doe you (discourfing at large) give your selfe to the proving of it; but onely suppose it. By the same reason you might say, that salvation is not the immediate effect of election unto salvation; because salvation in men of ripe years presupposeth faith, repentance and good workes.

Nay, you may as well say, that Gods giving of grace, is not an immediate effect of Gods love to any man; because in most men of ripe years it presupposeth many good workes. In *Saul* it presupposed his zeale and his righteousness according to the Law, which was unblameable. If you say that *Sauls* righteousness, whatsoever it was before his calling was no fruit of his love: I may with more probability affirme, that *Pharaohs* sin which preceded his obduration, was no effect of Gods hatred. If you say, that though such righteousness in *Saul* was no moving cause to God to give him saving grace: In like manner I say, that no sin in *Pharaoh* was a moving cause in God to deny him saving grace: For if it were, then either by necessity of nature,

ture, or by the constitution of God. Not by necessity of nature; for undoubtedly God could have pardoned this sin of his, and changed his heart, as well as he pardoned the sins of *Manasse*, the sins of the Jews in crucifying the son of God, *Act. 2.* the sins of *Saul* in persecuting Gods Saints; and changed all their hearts. Nor by any constitution of God; for shew mee if you can any such constitution of God. And if you would but explicate wherein the hardening of *Pharaoh* did consist, I presume it would clearly appeare, that the meere pleasure of Gods will is the cause of it, like as it is the meere pleasure of God that he doth not harden others in like manner: But when we carry our selves in the clouds of generalities, we are very apt to deceive not others onely, (if they will be deceived) but our selves also. Againe, you seem to speake of *Pharaohs* hardening mentioned *Exod. 9. 16.* And indeed for this cause have I appointed thee, to shew my power in thee, &c. Whereas from the first time that *Moses* was sent unto him hee was hardened, and that by God, according as God had told *Moses* before-hand, that hee would harden him. As for his sin, before ever *Moses* was sent unto him, you doe not take any speciall notice thereof at all; but whatsoever it were, as suppose the cruell edict of his in commanding the male children of the Hebrews to be cast into the River; like as God answered him most congruously in his works; first causing the waters of *Aegypt* to bee turned into blood; and in the last place making the waters of the red Sea, the grave of *Pharaoh* and of his Host: was this horrible sin any lesse then a consequent to more then ordinary obdurations for even heathen men are seldom exposed to such unnatural courses. So that if this obduration were an effect of Gods hatred, but not immediate; supposing sin according to the manner of your Discourse; then you must be put to devise some other sin as precedent to this obduration. And whereas that sin also cannot be denied to be a consequent to Gods denyall of effectuall grace to abtaine from sin, we shall never come to an end, till the cause of all these obdurations be at length resolved into originall sin; And what share I pray you hath the world of mankind therein, which Gods elect have not? When you tel us the hardening is a punishment of sin, it were very fit you should deal plainly, & tel us in what operation of God this work of hardening doth consist,

which

which I make no doubt, would cleare all. All confesse that God is not the cause of hardnesse of heart in any man, but man being borne in hardnesse of heart, *Ezek. 36. 3. 1.* God is said to harden, not *infundendo malitiam, sed non infundendo gratiam*: By leaving him thereunto, whereby it comes to passe that naturally it is increased, especially in case a man bee moved to courses contrary to his corrupt humours, whether by Gods word, or by his workes, and God doth not by grace correct those corrupt humours, which are so contrariant to good motions; good motions, I mean such as have their course onely in the way of instruction and perswasion; In this case thusto move and to deny grace is to harden. But when God doth forbear thus to move, and gives men over to follow the swing of their own lusts, this I confesse is to harden in greater measure, and properly a punishment. But this was not the manner of *Pharaohs* hardning. For long after the ninth Chapter of *Exodus* wee read how God continued to admonish *Pharaoh* by his servant *Moses* to let his people goe; neither ceased hee this Discipline till the ten plagues or nine of them at the least were fulfilled. And like as to shew mercy is not to move onely to obedience, but effectually to work men to obedience, so the hardning of man in opposition thereunto, consists not in not moving unto obedience, but rather in not working unto obedience, although they bee moved thereunto both in the way of instruction and exhortation. As for the punishing of sin with sin, in the hardning of the creature, let us understand our selves aright, and not confound our selves when wee need not. Is it a sober speech to say that God punisheth his denyall of grace, with denyall of Grace? or that God punisheth the sins of the heathen with the denyall of that grace, which they never enjoyed?

But as for the punishing of sin with sin, this is a large field of Gods providence consisting in divers kindes, and it is no way fit to consider them without distinction. God made the unnaturalnesse of *Senacheribs* Sons, a scourge to chastise *Senacheribs* unnaturalnesse towards God; one mans sinfull act to bee the punishment of anothers. Here is one kinde utterly distinct from that you treat of.

Again,

Again, some say, (and I think justly) and *Austin* acknowledgeth it, that every mans sin may bee a just punishment unto him in respect of a former, as *Rom.* 1. 25. When men for their Idolatry were given over to vile affections, to defile themselves in abominable manner, it is said that herein they *received in themselves, such recompence of their error, as was meete.* So *2 Theff.* 2. 10, 11. *Because men received not the truth of God with love, God is said to send them strong delusions, that they should believe lies.* Now seeing this concerneth the providence of God in evill, which is very secret, it were very fit that you should declare your opinion hereabout, and shew what operation of God it is, wherein consists the administration of this providence. When first, the one committed Idolatry contrary to the light of Nature, and the other received not the truth with love contrary to the light of grace: neither the one nor the other had any saving grace; and therefore, it is not decent to say that God exposed the one to doe things inconvenient, the other to beleaves lies, and herein punished them for their former misdemeanour, by denying unto them that which they never enjoyed. For to punish is either to inflict evil, which formerly they suffered not, or to withdraw some good which formerly they enjoyed. Now how God doth expose unconscionable Christians unto errors of Faith, is easily comprehended. For whereas unconscionable Christians apprehend the truth which they doe enjoy, but in a naturall and carnall manner, they may easily bee withdrawne from it, either by persecution or by seduction: Now it is in Gods power to send persecutors or seducers amongst them, and thereby expose them to the embracing of lies, for not imbracing his truth with love; or by withdrawing good Pastors and conscionable teachers from them: and then men being naturally more prone to error then to truth, especially in matter of Salvation; wee see hereby apparently how God can punish sin with sin in this kinde, not by denyall of grace which they never enjoyed, but by denying some outward means of grace which formerly they enjoyed. And withall it appears that this is nothing to our present purpose, who treat of obduration, as it consists in, or is joyned with the denyall of saving Grace, in proper opposition to the shewing of

of mercy; or affording saving grace. As touching the other examples wherein the administration of Gods providence is more obscure, while hee punisheth sin with sin; I say also that Gods punishing consists in denying, or not maintaining some kinde of grace, or rather not so much to bee called grace as a naturall restraint, not from sin in generall, (for that cannot bee but by saving grace) but from some sins in speciall, which are foule in the judgement of a naturall mans conscience; such as are those unnaturall defilements the Apostle speaks of *Rom. 1.* Now God in a naturall manner restraines men from such excesse, either for feare of shame of the world, or by reason of some naturall detriment that may arise thereby, or by the ministry of his Angels restraining the temptations of Satan in this kinde; And it is found by experience that *Nemo repente fit turpissimus*, but they grow to extreame by degrees, and the longer a man lives, the worse hee grows, if grace correct not the course of corrupt nature, according to that saying, *Nemo senex metuit Fovem*. Now if God shall forbear this restraint, and give them over to the power of Satan, they shall bee exposed to the commission of such abominable things, and therein they shall receive in themselves a just recompence of their former errors. And therewithall wee see how this case is as extravagant from our present purpose in discourting of obduration as the former. And you confesse that the hardning of *Pharaoh* is referred by the Apostle to the will of God; but withall you adde, that it is referred thereto, by him, as to the first cause thereof, whereas no such distinction or limitation suitable is expressed or implied by the Apostle; but onely for the advantage of your own opinion, you are pleased thus to shape it. And it is very strange that the Apostle should utterly omit such a cause as is of a most satisfying nature, and give himselfe to the pleading of that, which affords so little satisfaction in the judgement of flesh and blood, such as it seems they relish most of, with whom the Apostle enters upon this his Dialogue; neither doth the Apostle referre this to *Jacob* and *Esa* onely, as you fashion it (to hold up the difference you put between Gods hatred of *Esa* before hee was born, and his hatred of *Pharaoh*;) but to the obduration of *Pharaoh* also, nay, more properly to that, his ob-

duration alone being expressed, and the Apostle being upon an answer to an objection arising from the Apostles Doctrine concerning Gods soveraignty and liberty to harden whom hee will.

Besides this, you doe not well to qualifie the difference God puts between *Jacob* and *Esau*, as it it consisted onely in making *Esau Jacobs* servant, and *Jacob Esaus* Lord; according to your opinion it extends further then this, even to the granting of such grace to *Jacob* as should bee accompanied with salvation, and desying of the same to *Esau*, whereupon infallibly followed condemnation. It is true, God is just in dealing with *Esau*, and God is as just every whit, in dealing with *Jacob*; for hee deales with each according to the Law himself made. But God shewed mercy also unto *Jacob* in providing a Saviour to die for him, and in circumcising his heart, and making him to perform the condition of like, hee shewed no such mercy unto *Esau*.

You see well how incongruous it were to plead the sin of *Esau*, why hee should bee so dealt withall, seeing *Jacob* at that time deserved no better. But why doe you not observe, that this Discourse of the Apostle, hath every way as pregnant a reference to the obduration of *Pharaoh*, or of any one that is hardned, as to Gods dealing with *Esau*?

Again, suppose some are not so bad as *Pharaoh* was, when God hardens *Pharaoh*, and doth not harden others, but rather shews them mercy, will you say the reason hereof is because these deserved better at the hands of God then *Pharaoh*? Doe you not perceive how this Doctrine carryeth you ere you are aware, to trench upon the freeness of Gods grace in mans effectuall vocation? Suppose *Nicodemus* who sought to our Saviour by night were converted, and *Saul* had not been at all converted, but still hardned; would you have said that *Paul* was hardned because of his sin in persecuting the Church of God, but *Nicodemus* deserved better at the hands of God then *Saul*? Yet wee are sure that *Saul* in spite of all his persecution was converted, when in all probability many a morall Jew, and nothing factious in opposing the Gospel of Christ, yea and many a Gentile too were not converted, but perished in their sins, and in the blindness of their minde.

The wicked hardened for their sins.

195

Answer.

If it bee urged thereupon that God doth harden the creature and also hateth him with a positive hatred, without all respect of sin in the creature out of his absolute will.

I answer, in these deep counsels and unsearchable wayes of God, it is safe for us to wade no farther then wee may see the light of the Scriptures clearing our paths, and the grounds thereof paving our wayes, and as it were chalking it out before us. The Scripture telleth us, *That God hardens whom hee will.*

Rom. II. 1. 8. 9.
10. compared
with Psal. 69.
21. to 28. See
also Rom 1. 26
27, 28 Psal. 81.
11, 12.

And again, sin is the cause in which, and for which God doth harden any: both which will stand together.

That as God sheweth mercy on whom hee pleaseth; so hee hardneth whom hee pleaseth, out of his absolute will. Yet hardneth none but with respect of sin going before. For,

First, when wee speak of the reprobate with comparison of the elect, they are both alike sinners: And therefore if the question bee, why God hardneth the reprobate, and doth not harden, but shew mercy on the Elect? Here no cause can be rendred of this different dealing, but onely the will and good pleasure of God; sin is alike common to both, and cannot be alledged as the cause of this diversity. *Idem quia idem semper facit idem.* But when wee speak of the Reprobates alone considered in themselves: If the question bee, why God is pleased to harden them; The answer is alway truly, and safely given; It pleased God to harden them for their sins. And which is yet more, when God is said to harden a wicked man for his sin, it is not sin that moved God primarily to harden him; but his absolute will it was to harden him for his sin; for what sin could God see in the creature to provoke him to harden it, but what hee might have prevented by his providence, or healed by the blood of Christ, if it had so seemed good to his good pleasure? When therefore God doth harden a creature for his sin, it is because it is his good pleasure, even his absolute will so to harden him. To will a thing absolutely, and yet to will it on this or that condition, may well stand together in many a voluntary agent, when the condition is such, as that the will might easily help, if it so pleased. As if a man should cast off a servant for some disease hee hath, which hee might easily heale if it pleased

him: or break his vessell for some such uncleannesse which hee could easily rinse out; Both these may well bee said of him at once, that hee cast off his servant for his disease, and brake his vessell for its uncleannesse, and yet might hee cast out his servant and break his vessell, and both out of his good pleasure, and out of his absolute, and his free will.

Exam.

Rom. 9. 18.

It is true; the *Word of God is a Lamborn unto our feete, and a Light to our paths*, and it is fit wee should rest contented herewith for discovering unto us the whole counsell of God. Now this Word of God plainly teacheth us, that *God hardneth whom hee will*. Now I presume you doe not doubt, but that God out of his absolute will, *shews mercy on whom hee will*. Nay, I can hardly beleieve but that your opinion is, that like as God out of his absolute will granted saving grace to *Jacob*: so out of his absolute will hee denied saving grace to *Esau*. And still doth to those whom you account the world of mankind.

And I have already shewed that the deniall of this grace can bee no punishment; For as much as punishment consisteth, either in inflicting evill, or in denying some good which formerly was granted them. But in denying saving grace to the world of mankind, hee doth not deny them any thing which they formerly enjoyed.

I have already shewed, what that hardning is which is for sin, and wherein it doth consist, not in denying saving grace, which they never enjoyed, but in denying that naturall restraint from some foule sin, which formerly they enjoyed, as I exemplified it in that, *Rom. 1. 27*. That in *Rom. 11. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11*. is nothing for you, where there is no mention of sin as the cause of their obduration. As for that in *Psalm. 69. 21*. Their blinding is referred to their giving unto Christ *Gall in his meate, and in his thirst vinegar to drink*. I pray consider: Were they not even then blinded, when they persecuted Christ unto death? And yet notwithstanding some of these were converted, *Act. 2*.

But upon this their opposition unto Christ, God did proceed to blinde them more and more, but how? Not by denying saving illumination, for this they never enjoyed, it was denied them, from the first to the last.

But by withdrawing from them the meanes of illumination

on

on more and more, as namely the preaching of Gospel, and the working of miracles, and the giving them over unto the power of Satan. This also is *to give them over to their own hearts lust*, *Psalm 81. 11, 12.* by ceasing to admonish them of the error of their waies, either by his word, or by his judgements and chastisements in his works. That God doth harden out of his absolute will, and yet hardens none but for sin, cannot bee avouched in my judgment without manifest contradiction. If they are not contradictions; Then those also are not, *God hath mercy on whom hee will*, yet God hath mercy on none, but in respect of their good works going before.

Secondly, by the same reason it may bee said, that God condemnes men out of his absolute will, and yet hee condemnes none but for sin, yet you shall never read that God condemnes whom hee will.

Thirdly, if God doth harden out of his absolute will, then also hee did purpose to harden of his absolute will. Whence I infer that then God did not purpose to harden for sin. For Gods purpose to harden only in respect of sin, is commonly accounted (and that by your self) a will conditionate, and a will conditionate is opposite to a will absolute.

Lastly, I deny that God doth harden for their sins, as hardening denoteth a denyall of saving grace; For to harden for sin is to punish, but to deny saving grace to them that never had saving grace, is not to punish them; to leave a man in the state wherein hee findes him, is not to punish him. And therefore when *Epaminondas* ran his Javelin through a Sentinell whom hee found in sleepe, saying, I did but leave him as I found him, because sleep is usually said to bee *Mortis imago*, the Image of death, had hee no better Apologie for his fact then this, hee had no way freed himself from injustice. If God may harden man for sin, and yet sin shall not bee a primary cause moving God to harden him, by the same reason, though God condemnes man for sin, it is not necessary, that sin should bee a primary cause moving God to condemn him, which is directly contrary to your *enetic* in the point of reprobation. And this consideration of your own, if you hold your self unto it attentively, may bring you into the right way, from which you have erred, and the want of it hath

been a means I fear to confirm many in their errors. Wee acknowledge it to bee Gods absolute will to condemn for sin, but withall wee say it is his absolute will to permit whom hee will to sin, and continue in sin by denying saving grace to raise them out of sin. And this deniall of grace cannot bee for sin, as I have already proved. To harden a man, in opposition to Gods shewing mercy on him: wee take to bee nothing else then his refusall to cure him. Now let any man judge whether it bee a decent speech to say, that because a man is sick, therefore God will not cure him.

In the cases proposed by you, of casting a servant off for a disease which hee can cure if hee list, or breaking a vessell for some filthinesse which one may cleanse if hee will; whether this bee not to bee resolved into the absolute will of the Master, I am content to appeal to every sober mans judgement: although the comparisns are not congruous to the case wee have in hand; for as much as the casting of a servant off, is distinct from the not curing of him; the breaking of a vessell is distinct from the cleansing of it. But the hardning of a man, in opposition to Gods shewing mercy on him is nothing distinct from Gods refusing to cure him. If the question were proposed thus; Why will not a man cleanse his vessell when hee is able to cleanse it? why will hee not heale his servant when hee hath power to heale him? Is it a good reason to say, therefore hee heales him not, because hee is sick? therefore hee cleanseth not his vessell, because it is unclean? Neither is it a more sober speech to say, therefore God hardens a man because hee is a sinner; For it is as much as to say, therefore hee refuseth to cleanse him from his sin, because hee findes him unclean by reason of his sin.

Answ. The want of considering this point, hath as I conceive it, intangled the Doctrine of predelination with needlesse difficulties, and exposed it to rash and hard censures in the mindes of gain-sayers. Then it may bee said there was no cause of that objection, *Why complaineth hee, and who can resist his will?* or at least of that answer to, *why doth hee yet complaine?* Rom. 9. 20, 21, 22.

I answer, that objection propounded by the Apostle, *Why doth hee yet complaine? for who hath resisted his will?* doth not arise upon

upon occasion of Gods preferring *Jacob* before *Eſau*, but upon the latter part of the Corollary going immediately before, *v. 18. Whom hee will hee hardneſh*; for if it bee God that hardneſh the creature, and that according to his absolute will, then might the hardned creature ſay, what fault is there in mee to bee ſo hardned? Why doth God complain of mee for my hardneſſe and impenitency? *Who hath reſiſted his will?*

To make this objection colourable, wee need not ſay as you ſeem to imply, that the Apoſtle gave occasion of it, by aſcribing the hardning of *Pharaoh* and other reprobates to Gods absolute will, and without all reſpect to ſin; yet the creature hardned, is wont to plead with God about it, *Eſa. 63. 17.* you ſhall there ſee Gods own people to erre, and upon their error, to have their hearts hardned from Gods ſeaſe, and both done by God, and yet the people expoſtulate with God about it, which if Gods own people may doe reverently, is it any wonder if the reprobates doe the ſame upon the ſame occasion petulantly and profanely?

But the answer of the Apoſtle to the objection propounded, cleareth the whole matter; For, as a man would juſtifie the ſevere proceedings of a Maſter of a Colledge, in reſuſing to elect an unworthy perſon, and in ſtead thereof expelling him the Colledge by pleading, firſt, the liberty or authority of his negative voyce: Secondly, the deſert of the perſon reſuſed and expelled. So the Apoſtle beateth down the inſolency of the objection, and pleadeth the juſtice of Gods proceedings againſt Reprobates hated and hardned, from, firſt, the Sovereignty of God over his creature, *ver. 20, 21.* ſecondly, the due deſerts of perſons being veſſels of wrath, and fitted for deſtruction, *ver. 22.*

What theſe needleſſe difficulties are, wherewith the Doctrin Exam. of predeſtination is intangled, by the Doctrin of them whom you impugne, you doe not expreſſe, nor the hard and harſh cenſures which are paſſed upon it, that by due comparing of the one to the other, wee might examine how juſtly ſuch cenſures are pronounced.

But of what nature your opinion is, how inconſiſtent in it ſelf; on how little reaſon it is grounded; what conſequences it draws after it, as alſo what cauſeleſſe fears you raiſe un-

God doth not harden upon desert.

to your self; and above all, and which is worst of all, how you deal with Scripture in this argument, to serve your turn, I leave it to your conscience to judge, not to mention how this Discourse of yours is found to harden many in the way of error, and to offend others in the way of truth.

Indeed there were no cause of any such objection as that, *Rom. 9. 29.* if so be God hardens no man but for sin, and withall it is just with God to harden men in their sins, and lesse cause of such an answer, *Rom. 9. 20, 21, 22.* No man, I think, makes any doubt but that the objection, *Why doth hee complain? for who hath resisted his will?* ariseth from the 18 ver. where it is said, that God as hee hath mercy on whom hee will, so hee hardneth whom hee will, even as hee hardned Pharaoh; but yet you doe not shape the objection right, when you shape it thus; *What fault is there in mee to bee hardned?* which is in effect as if you would shape it thus; Wherein then have I deserved to bee hardned? For the negative to this, namely, that God doth not harden upon desert, is that which the Apostle avoucheth; Like as neither doth hee shew mercy upon desert. But like as upon the meere pleasure of his will, hee shews mercy on some: So, according to the good pleasure of his will, hee hardneth others. But well might hee say, why then doth hee complain of the hardnesse of my heart, and my impenitency; or rather the Apostle proposeth it, in reference to the fruits of mans hardnesse of heart and impenitency, such as God complains of, *Esa. 1. I have nourished and brought up a people, and they have rebelled against mee.* And *Esa. 56. All the day long have I stretched out mine hands to a rebellious people, that walk in a way which is not good, even after their own imaginations.* Or as if Pharaoh, hearing of this ministry of Gods providence, should say, *Why doth hee complain of the hardnesse of my heart in not letting Israel goe, when hee hath hired my beare: that I should not let Israel goe, and who hath resisted his will?*

I have already shewed that this hardning of Pharaoh, and so likewise of all reprobates, as it consists in denying of saving grace, in congruous opposition to Gods mercy, proceeds meerly according to the good pleasure of Gods will: And the Apostle plainly signifies as much, when hee saith, *That like as God hath mercy on whom hee will, so hee hardneth whom hee*

will;

will ; Neither doth hee take into consideration any sin of theirs as the cause of hardning, either in the proposition delivered by him, or in answer to the objection arising there-hence. Why then should wee bee moved with your bare word in saying, wee need not say that the Apostle gave occasion of this objection, by ascribing the hardning of *Pharaoh* and other reprobates to Gods absolute will, and without all respect to sin, as the deserving cause thereof. Neither do you give any reason of that you avouch, in saying, that albeit God doth not harden but in respect of sin; yet the creature will pleade or expostulate; as indeed it is most unreasonable to ask why God doth complain of hardnesse of heart, and the fruits thereof, when it hath been shewed that this hardnesse of heart hath been brought upon man for his own sin, and no exception taken against it. But when out of Gods absolutenesse men are hardned, then, and not till then may it justly seem strange that God should complain of the hardnesse of mens hearts, and the fruites thereof. As for the place of *Esa. 63. 17.* Wherein you suppose Gods people to expostulate with God for hardning them, notwithstanding they suppose that God hardens them for their sin, this is to beg the question, and not to prove ought, there being no evidence of any such acknowledgment as you suppose, namely, that God doth harden them for their sins. Yet if there were any such acknowledgment, it would not forthwith make for your purpose unless they should acknowledge as much of that obduration, the Apostle speaks of, where hee sets it in opposition to Gods shewing mercy. To serve your turn, you take liberty to interpret the coherence of these parts, *to erre from thy waies, and to bee hardned against thy feare* : as if the former were the cause of the other, upon no other ground that I know, but that thus it shall stand in more congruity with your opinion. Whereas, indeed there is a farre greater probability, that hardning against the feare of God should bee the cause of the errour of our wayes, then that errour of our wayes should bee the cause of our hardning against the feare of God; especially taking hardning, not confusedly hand over head, but distinctly in opposition to Gods shewing mercy in mans conversion; I take them only as severall expressions of the same things consisting of an in-

ward corrupt disposition as the roote, and that I conceive to bee the want of the feare of God; and the fruit hercof, which is aberration from the good wayes of the Lord.

Jer. 32. 40.

And they expostulate with God, for not correcting all this by his grace, as by his Covenant of grace, which hee hath made with them, hee hath ingaged himself hereunto, even to keep them from going astray, like a good Shepherd, and to put his feare into their hearts, that they shall never depart away from him; Which kinde of expostulation is nothing answerable to that which the Apostle propoeth to answer, *Rom. 9. 16.* And I may well wonder what you meant to yoke them together: *Non bene inaequales veniunt ad aratra iuvenae.* The children of God doe not expostulate with God for his complaining of their disobedience, unthankfulnesse, and rebellions against him, though they heartily wish they had never provoked him, and expostulate with him for not preserving them by his grace, from such courses of provocation of him, even of the eyes of his glory. The wicked have no such desire to bee preserved from sin and sinfull courses, which are unto them as sweet bits, which they roule under their tongues; Although when they heare of the Doctrine of obduration and his power to harden them, and in hardning they may take advantage thereby to blaspheme God, and to plead Apologie for themselves; Belike then you acknowledge that God hath power to harden without respect to sin, for to this purpose tends your comparative illustration.

But then you must bee driven to deny that obduration is a punishment; seeing it is impossible that just punishments can have course but with respect to sin, as a meritorious cause thereof. That God beateth down the objectour, and pleadeth the justice of Gods proceedings against Reprobates, from the soveraign authority of God over his creatures is most true, *ver. 20, 21.* But that hee pleads the *due desert of the persons, ver. 22.* thereby to justifie God in hardning whom hee will, is positively avouched, but so farre from truth, as that it involves plain contradiction; no lesse then if the Apostle after hee had said that God hath mercy on whom hee will; should afterward take a course to justifie God herein, by saying that God hath mercy on none, but in respect to their former good works.

Nay,

Nay, much more contradictions; for as much as no good works in the state of nature or grace, can bee meritorious of reward. But sins may bee and are truly meritorious of punishment. In the 22 *vers.* there is not the least mention of obduration, much lesse any mention of the cause thereof, least of all, any reversing of the former cause (expressed *ver.* 18. and justified *ver.* 20. from the authority of God the Creator, having power to make his creatures of what fashion hee will,) and substituting a new in the place thereof. And although all that are vessels of wrath are sinners, and consequently deserve punishment, yet obduration, in opposition to shewing mercy, consisting in the denyall of saving grace, is no punishment, for as much as God doth not thereby withdraw any saving grace from them, which formerly they enjoyed; and as for inflicting evil, that hath no place in obduration, for as much as all confesse that God doth not obdurate any man, *infundendo malitiam*, but *non infundendo gratiam*. Neither is it sin either originall, or actuall, that which constitutes a man a vessell of wrath, as a vessell of wrath is opposite to a vessell of mercy. For sin both originall and actuall is incident to the Elect as well as to the Reprobate: but like as Gods shewing mercy makes a man a vessell of mercy: so Gods denyall of mercy, finally constitutes a vessell of wrath, exposing him to finall infidelity or impenitency, which sin alone is not found in any of the elect. It seems you think they are fitted to destruction by themselves, as if *vasa* the vessels did separate, and not *Herus* the Master rather. Sin alone makes a man obnoxious to condemnation as deserving it, and so there is sin in the best of Gods children, to drive them to confesse, that if the Lord should bee extreame to mark what is done amisse, none were able to abide it: Yet the sin of the Reprobates you confesse God could prevent, and not preventing it, yet could cure it by the blood of Christ, so that though sin bee granted to bee a cause hereof, yet a more originall cause (though nothing culpable) must bee acknowledged to bee the denyall of Grace; as our Saviour budgeth not to professe to the faces of some; *Tee therefore beare not my words, because yee are not of God,* and *Joh. 12. 40. Therefore they could not beleeve,* because *Esaias* saith, Hee hath blinded their eyes, and hardned their hearts,

that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their hearts, and should bee converted, and I should heale them.

Answer.

All this while have I maintained, the safeness of that exposition which interpreteth Gods hatred of *Esau*, of a lesse degree of love, and the same word is also used in the same sense; But yet so understand mee, I conceive this lesse degree of Love, to have somewhat in it of the true nature of Hatred. For as the nature of Love standeth in affecting communion with one, and communicating good unto him: So likewise the nature of hatred stands in the contrary to this, either in affecting separation from one, or inflicting evill on him, or at least in not vouchsafing communion, or communicating good unto him. So is a man said to hate his brother, that will not vouchsafe him such an office of brotherly communion, as that hee will communicate a kindly reproofe to him for his sin.

Now I would easily grant, that before *Esau* had done good or evill, God so hated him, as that hee did not communicate to him that fellowship with Christ, which by Gods election and donation the members of the body have with him their head in Gods account, even before the world was. Neither did God vouchsafe that plentifull communication of his free grace unto him, as might in time by a reall actuall power draw him to Christ and to live by him: Yea God was pleased to set him in a state further remote, and separate from him then his elect brother: Even in the estate of a servant to the elect: and in stead of communicating free grace, hee purposed to deale with him rather according to his works, by a covenant of Justice; For both these are implied in Gods putting of *Esau* into the state of a servant.

First, the denyall of such grace and fatherly love to him as is reserved for children.

Secondly, the (not) refusing of him to just dealing, such as is due to servants according to their works.

Exam.

I look to receive from you some prooffe that the word Hatred is used in the same sense, to wit, to signifie a lesse degree of Love, for to my judgement, it is a wilde interpretation; for in this sense God might bee said to hate every one of Gods elect excepting Christ, for hee loves them all in a lesse degree then.

then hee loved Christ, and one in a lesse degree then another, according as degrees of Love attributed to God are to be estimated, that is, not *quoad affectum*, (for undoubtedly there are no degrees to be found in the nature of God) but *quoad effectum*, and undoubtedly God alots one degree of grace to one, and another degree to another, and as hee deales with them in communicating of grace, so in the communicating of Glory also. Love and hatred, undoubtedly are opposite contrarily, and not onely contradictorily. And because *quot modis dicitur unum oppositum, tot modis dicitur & alterum*; as love of complacency consists in delectation, so hatred opposite is of displicency or averfation. And as love of beneficence consisteth in wishing or doing good: So hatred opposite consists in wishing or doing evill to another.

Here at length I observe the place you stand upon to prove that hatred in holy Scripture, doth sometimes signifie a lesse degree of love, and that seemes to be *Levit. 19. 17. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, thou shalt plainly rebuke thy brother, and suffer him not to sin.* And to serve your turn in this interpretation, you shape a correspondent practise of Love consisting in vouchsafing communion; which unlesse it be a communion of reproofe, is nothing to your purpose, who desire to shape hatred in contradiction thereunto. And yet hatred, all conceiveto be much more then not to love. But were all this yeelded unto you, yet doth it fall short of your purpose; for albeit hee that forbears to reprove his brother, doth him harm, yet if hee doe not intend him harm, hee cannot be said to hate him. For in Scripture phrase hatred denotes an intention to harm, as *Deut. 4. 42.* Where wee read that certain Cities were appointed, *That the slayer might fly unto, which had killed his Neighbour at unawares, and hated him not in times past.* But if you measure hatred by the harm done, why should the sparing of reproofe to preserve a brother from sin, and consequently from incurring the wrath of God, be so qualified as to be accounted a lesse degree of love, and not a fruite of hatred: for consider I beseech you, is not this farre worse then to mischiefe a man by cutting off an arm or limb? So that albeit Scripture did plainly professe that not to reprove a neighbour, but suffer him to sin, were an act of ha-

tred, yet it followeth not hence, that hatred in this case signifies onely a lesse degree of love. For certainly, such an act (to wit, in sparing reproofe) is worse by far then to give a man a box on the eare; yet I presume you will not interpret that to bee hatred onely in such a sense, as signifying a lesse degree of Love. For certainly the fruites of love are the communications of good, and not any contumelious inflicting of evill. But by your leave I doe not finde that this is the Scriptures meaning in the place you aime at; but rather in my judgement it seems to meet with a corrupt course of the world, prone to conceive none to bee their greater enemies, then such as reprove them. To prevent this, the Lord forbids the one, to wit, the hating of our brother, and as expressly commands the other, to wit, to reprove our Neighbour, manifesting thereby that reproofe may bee performed, without any just suspicion of hatred in him that reproveth. In fine, this interpretation of hatred which here you make, is embraced by *Vossius* in his *Pelagion* Story; but hee doth not betray that hee is beholding to *Cornelius de Lapide* the Jesuite for it, in his Commentaries on the ninth to the *Romans*. And hee brings other manner of instances to prove it then you doe. And so doth *Junius* also in *Gen. 29. 31.* though hee were farre enough off from applying it in the same sense to *Esau*, as his son in law *Vossius* doth, and the Jesuite doth before *Vossius*.

In few words your meaning is, God did so far hate *Esau*, even before hee had done good or evill, that hee did not destinate unto him any saving grace as hee did unto *Jacob*. May you not as well say that hee did not destinate unto him glory, as hee did to *Jacob*? And even this in *Aquinas* his language is to hate, where hee interpreteth Gods hatred of *Esau* before hee was born. Yet you might bee pleased to goe a little further, and to affirm that God did not onely not destinate unto him any saving grace, but also that God was purposed to deny him such saving grace as hee granted unto *Jacob*, and consequently hee purposed to deny him glory also; if you bee pleased to gratifie your self in yeelding to this truth, wee will willingly gratifie you in acknowledging that notwithstanding all this, God purposed to deale with *Esau* according to his works.

As for that phraſe of yours of putting him into the eſtate of a ſervant; though it bee of little materiall conſideration in this place, yet I have ſufficiently diſcuſſed it, in examining your Answer to the firſt Doubt.

The Fifth Doubt.

Queſtion, 5.

How may it appeare that all have a ſufficiency of comming to Chriſt, ſince no man can come without drawing? *Job.* 6. 44. 65. and hee who is drawn ſhall bee raiſed to life; or ſince no man can come except it bee given him of the Father. Which ſpeech is a reaſon why wee ought not to murmure or bee offended if ſome beleeeve not, *Rom.* 11. 7. and ſince none but the Eleſt by the meanes of helpe and power, *Revelat.* 2. 15.

Answer.

I no where ſay, nor ever thought that all men had a ſufficiency of power to beleeeve or to come to Chriſt. Far bee it from mee to avouch ſuch ungracious Pelagianiſme; But this I ſay, God giveth to the men of this world, this world, I ſay, as oppoſed to the eleſt, ſuch meanes and helps of ſeeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him, that they are ſufficiently enabled by him to doe much more then they doe, that way, they are deprived of thoſe drawing and effectuall means without which none can come, and with which none ever failed to come to Faith and Repentance: Elſe how ſhall wee underſtand theſe and ſundry ſuch like places of Scripture, *Act.* 17. 25, 26, 27. *Rom.* 1. 19. to 25. *Rom.* 2. 4, 5. 14, 15. *Luk.* 16. 11, 12. *Act.* 1. 51, 52. *Act.* 13. 46. *Matth.* 22. 37, 38. *Luk.* 19. 41, 42. *Ezek.* 24. 13. *Prov.* 1. 20. to 30. 2 *Chron.* 36. 15, 16. *Hoſe.* 11. 4. *Eſa.* 5. 3, 4, 5. *Job* 33. 14. to 18. *Job.* 16. 69? From all which places I gather foure Concluſions, pertinent to the point in hand.

Fiſt, That God offereth to the men of this world, helps and means, either of the knowledge of God in Nature, or of grace in Chriſt: and that to this end, to lead them to Repentance and Salvation. Thus is God ſaid to manifeſt to the Gentiles,

Means of Salvation offered.

tiles, that which may bee known of him by his works, and by his Law written in their hearts, and that to this end, to make them to seek after the Lord; to leade them to Repentance, to withdraw them from their courses, to heale their pride and to save their soules from the pit. Thus God offered to the carnall Israelites means of grace to purge them, to turn them, *Prov. 1. 13.* to gather them, *Mat. 23. 37.* to convince them, *Job. 16. 8, 9.* To draw them with cords of man and bands of love, *Hos. 11. 4.* To dresse them to bring forth good fruit, *Esa. 5. 4.*

Secondly, That the meanes God useth for these good ends, are in some measure sufficient (if they bee not hindered by men) to bring them to the attainment of these ends: for when God saith himself, hee useth these meanes for these ends; for us to say, these meanes are not sufficient for these ends, seemeth to mee to derogate from the wisdom and sufficiency of God, whose works are all of them perfect, *Deut. 32. 4.* and so sufficient for the ends for which hee wrought them. Yet God forbid I should doubt of that which our Saviour telleth the Jews, No man can come to Christ, except the Father draw him, *Joh. 6. 44.* by the same Almighty power and authority, whereby hee sent Christ into the world.

Exam.

The whole tenour of your Answer in clearing the Fifth Doubt looks this way, as if you maintained a sufficiency of power in those whom wee account Reprobates to perform such things, upon the performance whereof they should bee saved. I confesse you doe not make any expresse mention of Faith, but of obedience in generall, and of repentance; which I presume you will acknowledge, will bee inseparable from Faith. And that you doe acknowledge a sufficiency in them to perform Obedience and Repentance requisite to Salvation, I prove thus:

You maintain a true desire in God, of their Salvation; and how can this stand with the denyall of such sufficiency as is in his power to grant?

Againe, You expressly maintain, that there is in God, a serious and fervent affection, not concerning their Salvation only, but their Conversion also. Which how it can stand with a denyall of sufficient power to turn unto God, I comprehend not.

Third-

Thirdly, You plainly affirm, that mankind *slights to work out with the Trinity, their Salvation.* Now no man can bee said to slight the doing thereof, for the doing whereof hee hath no power. You maintain there is in a reprobate mans power to work out his salvation with the Trinity.

Fourthly, the comparifon you make to represent Gods different dealing with his Elect, and with the reprobate, doth intimate as much. The servant you say is only perswaded to yeeld himself to bee cut, that hee may bee cured of the stone, yet earnestly and forcibly perswaded: The son over and above is taken by the Father and bound and cut, that hee may bee cured. Now as it is in the power of the servant to yeeld to bee cut, that hee may bee cured, so do you hereby intimate that it is in the power of a Reprobate to yeeld to bee converted, that God may heale him.

Fifthly, you doe acknowledge that Gods purpose to give life unto the world upon condition of obedience, doth imply that God should accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience; for you plainly signifie that God purposing to give life unto the world upon condition of obedience, doth accordingly give meanes to help them to the performance of this obedience. Now I say, Gods purpose to give life unto the world, upon condition of obedience, doth no more imply that God must accordingly give means to help them to the performance of this obedience, then that God must accordingly give ability by the help of such means to perform obedience. And indeed, to what end tends the giving of means to help them to the performance of obedience, if they have not ability by the help of those means to perform obedience? In this very Section you professe the meanes which God affords are sufficient to bring them to those gracious ends, which God (you say) intends, if they bee not hindred by men. Which doth imply that in your opinion, the men of the world have power to give way unto them, and not hinder them. Yet I confesse you are very sparing to confesse so much. But the more you are to blame by the face of your discourse to bespeak such opinions in your Readers, and to draw unto them, the maintenance whereof you dare not undertake your self. But let us consider what you deliver hereupon. And

Ec

First,

No power in the Means to bring men

First, though you doe not attribute unto a naturall man sufficiency, and power to beleeve: yet if you doe attribute unto him sufficiency of power to perform ought, upon performance whereof grace shall bee given him, whereby hee shall bee enabled to beleeve and to come to Christ, you shall even in this bee guilty of that, which you call ungracious Pelagianisme. Now as for your opinion of the power of a naturall man, you here expresse it partly negatively, partly affirmatively. You confesse, they are deprived of those drawing and effectuall meanes, without which none can come, and with which, none ever failed to come to Faith and Repentance. Touching which I have something to oppose concerning the phrase, and something concerning the assertion it self.

The word *meanes* used by you, and which you call effectuall, wee commonly understand as things outward; such as either the Word of God, and the Ministry thereof, or the Works of God and the manifestation of his providence therein. But you seem to goe further, and comprehend thereby the effectuall operation of Gods Spirit, which is very ambiguous, and being delivered in the generall, is the fitter to serve a mans turn, sometimes in the one, sometimes in the other signification. As touching the assertion it self, it utterly overthrowes all that you have delivered in clearing the fifth Doubt. For with what sobriety can God bee said to entertain an earnest and serious affection, concerning their conversion, (which is as much as to say concerning their repentance) being resolved to deprive them of those drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to repentance?

Again, how can God bee said to entertain an earnest and serious affection concerning their Salvation, being resolved to deprive them of those drawing and effectuall meanes, without which none can come to Repentance, and consequently without which none can bee saved? As for the affirmative part, you say the Reprobates are sufficiently enabled by God, to do much more then they doe, in seeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him, and that by certain means and helps. Now in this place I conceive by means and helps you understand only outward things, as either the administration of Gods providence in his Works, or the ministry of his Word, and not
the

the effectuall operation of Gods Spirit, bestowing any power upon them, which naturally they had not, though this must needs bee your meaning in the negative part of the assertion. But as touching the assertion it self, there is no question but every naturall man, hath power to doe more then hee doth, in the way of actions naturall, but in the way of doing ought that is good, and pleasing in the sight of God, I know no power incident to a naturall man: for as much as the Apostle saith, *They that are in the flesh cannot please God.* Yet I confesse according as the world accounts morality, every naturall man hath power to doe more good then hee doth, and to abstain more from evill then hee doth, that is, hee may give more Almes then hee doth, hee may bee more temperate then hee is: but whether hee doth that, which for the substance of the action is accounted good; or abstaines from some particular evill actions; yet neither the one nor the other is or can bee performed by him in a gracious, but rather in an ungracious manner; and whether this bee accounted, a seeking after the Lord, and that to finde mercy from him, I dare appeale to your own judgement; yet this is not all you maintain. For whereas the Lord may bee sought after, as the God and governour of nature onely; you further say in the next page, that there is a sufficiency of power in the means, to lead the men of this world, to come to the knowledge of God, and to grace in Christ.

But let us examine the places of Scripture, which you muster up in great abundance. The first is out of *Act. 17. 25, 26, 27.* There wee read that *God is not worshipped with mens hands, as though hee needed any thing, seeing hee giveth to all, life and breath and all things. 26. And hath made of one blood all mankind, to dwell upon all the face of the earth, and hath assigned the seasons which were ordained before, and the bounds of their habitation. 27. $\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\eta$, That they should seek the Lord, if so bee they might have groped after him and found him, though doubtlesse hee bee not farre from every one of us. 28. For in him wee live and move, &c.* This seemes to bee the most principall place whereon you insist, not only by setting it in the first place, but in as much as you deliver your opinion, in the phrase of seeking the Lord, here alone expressed. But this doth nothing serve your turn.

What it is, To seek the Lord,

For first, here is no mention at all of any sufficiency and power, that naturall men either by this providence of God, or otherwise have attained unto for seeking of the Lord. For consider I pray; the manifestation of Gods grace in his word, is farre more able to inable us to seek the Lord, then the manifestation of his providence in his works; yet by the manifestation of his grace in his word, it followeth not that as many as are partakers thereof, are indued with power of seeking the Lord in such sort as to finde mercy from him. I confesse that *to seek the Lord* is a phrase of a very generall signification, not denoting any materiall action, but containing only a certain denomination, which may passe upon many materiall actions; and this Discourse of yours is throughout carryed in such generalities, which are very apt to deceive. For in genere latent multe equivocaciones. And for a man to rest on such, is to bee in love with his own errors. But I am confident it is onely your zeale of justifying God in his waies against the imputation cast upon him by flesh and blood, that makes you take hold of, and content your self with such generall notions, I should think that *ζητῆσαι τὸν κύριον* to seek the Lord, in this place, in reference to Gods workes, is of the same signification in the generall with *ζητῆσαι τὸν κύριον*, to seek the Lord, in reference to his word; that is the thing, not whereunto we are hereby enabled, but the thing whereof wee are thereby admonished. As Verse 30. it is said, *Now bee admonished every man, every where to repent*; to wit, by the preaching of his Word: Hee doth not say, *Hee doth enable every man, every where to repent*. So; *The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy-worke*: And that which may bee knowne of God, is made manifest by his workes. Rom. 1. And hee leaves not himselfe without witnesse, giving rain and fruitfull seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladnesse. And so here, Hee hath assigned the seasons which hee ordained before, and the bounds of their habitations *ζητῆσαι τὸν κύριον*, to seek the Lord, that is, as I conceive, to admonish them to seek the Lord: forasmuch, as though the invisible things of God, are said to be manifested by his workes: yet it is in such a manner, as it requires study and deep contemplation, to attaine to these invisible things of God, in the most indifferent measure:

But

Psal. 191. 1.

Rom. 1. 20.

Act. 14. 17.

But say, wee have power, and all men have power to seek the Lord, that is, to search out those invisible things of God, which are made manifest by his Works, as many Naturalists have done; and to give instance: As *Aristotle* hath searched after an *Eus primum*, a first being; and hath found out immateriall substances, and amongst them a first mover, in the contemplation of whom the felicity of all the rest consists; and hath delivered strange conclusions concerning his Nature: Yet I deny that any man hath power naturall, so to seek after the Lord, as to finde mercy from him. To this purpose it is not enough to know him as the Authour of Nature, but wee must take forth, and know him as a Redeemer, and authour of Grace. For I presume you wil not say that *Aristotle* after his most studious inquisitions after the Lord, did finde mercy from him.

Nay, this great searcher into the secrets of Nature, denyed his Omnipotency, for they could not bee drawn to beleieve that hee was able to produce any thing out of nothing, this was the generall opinion of them all in a manner. Thence hee proceeded to deny that the world had a beginning: and to maintain that God wrought all that hee wrought by necessity of nature, and not by freedom of will. Yet this eternall power and Godhead they did acknowledge, and that hee was to bee worshipped for the dignity of his nature. But not either out of feare of punishment, or hope of reward. Such notions were rather popular then Scholasticall, a manifest evidence that the world was brought to conceive more soberly of the nature of God, by instinct of Nature, then by discourse of reason. For such as followed discourse of reason most, became most Atheisticall as touching the providence of God; yet all agreed in this, that hee was incorruptible, which was sufficient to convict them of impiety, in changing the glory of the uncorruptible God unto the similitude of the Image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of foure-footed beasts, and creeping things. And did not they profit best in the Schoole of Nature, who by the observation of providence in the way of mercies and judgments, were driven to acknowledge an unknown God, and to erect Altars for his worship? And as for seeking of the Lord, so as to finde him in any comfortable manner, doth not the Apostle as good as confesse despaire of such

No power naturall, to seek the Lord,

power in naturall men, when forthwith hee addeth, *If so bee they might have grasped after him, and found him, though doubtlesse bee not farre from every one of us, for in him wee live, move, and have our being.* And yet as for the Apostles finding of him in this place, I should rather thinke that it is in reference to the apprehension of his nature (as the Creator of all) rather then of his goodnesse (as a Redeemer) so to finde mercy from him though you seem to aime at this interpretation.

Your second place is out of *Rom. 1. 19. to 25.* *That which may bee known of God is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them.* Where? *In his works,* as it followeth, *For the invisible things of him, that is, his eternall power and God-head, are seen (not by, but) from the creation of the world, being considered in his works.* If the Apostle had here added *ἵνα τοὺς ἄνθρωποις αἰσθάνωνται καὶ ἀναζητήσωσιν τὸν κύριον*, to seek the Lord, and to finde mercy from him, it had bene more faire for your purpose. But the Apostle addes *ἵνα ἡ ἀνομιὰ αὐτῶν ἐκτελέσῃ* to the intent that they should bee without excuse, viz. in a particular case, to wit, because they did not glorifie God as God, but turned the glory of the incorruptible God i. to the similitude of the Image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things. Neither do wee deny but men have power to discern the nature of God, to bee incorruptible, and consequently they are inexcusable in the way of Idolatry. But whereas Idolatry is but the third kinde of blasphemy, in attributing to the creature, that which belongs to God himself. And there are two sorts of blasphemy besides this: One in attributing to God that which doth not become him. Another in denying unto God that which doth become him; will you say that every naturall man hath power to discern the nature of God in such sort as to preserve himself from blasphemy every way?

The third place is out of *Rom. 2. 4. 5.* *Despiseest thou the riches of his bountifulnesse, and patience, and long sufferance, not knowing that the bountifulnesse of God leadeth thee to repentance? 5. But thou after thine hardnesse, and heart that cannot repent, heapest up unto thy self, as a treasure, wrath against the day of wrath.* Now if this doth imply any ability in man of seeking the Lord, and finding mercy from him, it must needs bee in the way of repentance. And this I confesse is a cleare way, both of seeking the

the Lord, and of finding mercy from him. But dare you say that a naturall man hath power to repent? I presume you will not, unlesse you frame repentance after such a notion, as will bee found to bee neither seeking of the Lord, nor finding mercy from him. And you your self here professe, that *God deprives them of those drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to repentance.* And in the very place alledged, it is expressely said of them whom God is said to lead to repentance, that *the hardnesse of their heart is such, that they cannot repent.*

The fourth is taken out of *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* *When the Gentiles which have not the Law, doe by nature the things contained in the Law, they having not the Law, are a law unto themselves, which shew the effect of the Law written in their heart, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts accusing one another, or excusing.* I wish things were carryed with lesse ostentation, and with more judgement, then to alledge Scriptures, and put the Reader upon making Arguments for them thence. For my part I see no colour in all this, to justifie any power and sufficiency in a Reprobate to seek the Lord, and to finde mercy from him: though I make no question, but they have power to abstain from many things prohibited in the Law of God, and to doe things commanded, as touching the substance of the duty commanded, or the action forbidden: though they are farre enough off from doing it for Gods sake, and out of the love of God, with all their heart, and with all their soule, as whom they knew not even the very best of them, *1 Cor. 1. 21.* *1 Thess. 4. 5.*

The fifth is drawn out of *Luk. 16. 11, 12.* *If yee have not been faithfull in the wicked riches, who will trust you in the true treasures? And if you have not been faithfull in another mans goods, who shall give you that which is your own?* Hence you seem to infer, that carnall men, naturall men, have power and ability to perform faithfulness in the administration of temporall riches: and you might proceed further to inferre, that by performing such fidelity, which is in their power to perform, they should have true riches, and such as should never bee taken from them. And what is to maintain that God doth dispence grace according to works, if this bee not? And yet this latter

latter is with more probability inferred then the former. For certainly God doth reward faithfulness in little, with the bestowing of greater gifts, as *Matth. 25. 21. 23.* But albeit they that are unfaithfull in little, are unworthy to have greater gifts bestowed upon them; yet herehence it doth not follow, that meer naturall men have so much power of goodnesse in them, as to bee faithfull unto God in the use of those naturall gifts which God hath bestowed upon them, (yet in spight of this unworthinesse, which God findes in his Elect, before their calling, hee doth neverthelesse trust them with true riches. And if they were faithfull therein, they would bee found faithfull also in greater things. For *ver. 10.* our Saviour professeth, *That hee who is faithfull in the least, is also faithfull in much.*

The sixth place is, *Act. 7. 51, 52.* *Ye stiff-necked, and of uncircumcised hearts and eares, yee have alwayes resisted the Holy Ghost. 52. Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers persecuted? That which you stick upon (I doubt not) is this, that they are said alway to have resisted the Holy Ghost, both they and their Fathers. Wee deny it not: but will you herehence infer that they had power and ability to yeeld to the Holy Ghost? If this inference like you, then you may bee bold to inferre in like manner, That because many resist the Holy Ghost moving them to faith and repentance; therefore they have power and ability to yeeld to the Holy Ghost in this also, that is, to beleeve and repent. Yet your self professe in this very Section, that God deprives them of those drawing and effectuell means, without which none can come, to wit, to the Lord, and finde mercy from him; which yet undoubtedly they should do, did they beleeve and repent. Yet I deny not, but they might have abstained from persecuting the Prophets; but I deny that it was in the power of any of them (being but naturall men) to abstaine from it in a gracious manner, and acceptable in the sight of God. And so long as they did not abstain so, is it fit to call it a seeking after the Lord, or finding of mercy from him? I presume you will not deny but that many a Jew in the Apostles daies were free from faction, contenting himself to enjoy his own course quietly and peaceably, was yet further off from grace then *Paul* that persecuted the Church; God calling him in the midst of his furious pursuite, and not calling*

ling others though farre more peaceably disposed toward the Church of God then *Saul*.

The seventh place alledged is *Act. 13. 46.* Then Paul and Barnabas spake boldly, and said, It was necessary that the Word should first have been spoken unto you, but seeing you put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, wee turn unto the Gentiles. Hence you inferre that these Jewes were inabled to doe more then they did in seeking the Lord, and finding mercy from him. But I would gladly know wherein that seeking of the Lord consists? Had they not railed against Paul, (as I confesse they had power to spare that) had they not contraried him, nor spoken against those things which were spoken by him, as I confesse they might have held their tongue; had this been to seek the Lord more then they did? or in better manner then they did? I think not: for they might have contained themselves from all this, nay, they might have pretended some propensions to imbrace the Gospel, which yet had it been performed in hypocrisie, it had nothing commended them in the sight of God. As *Diasius*, when hee could not prevaile with his brother to draw him back to Popery, pretended some propension in himself to hearken unto him; but wee know what the issue was, even to slit his head, as the issue of *Judas* his following Christ was to betray him. I think they that deale so, and through zeale persecute the Church, as *Saul* did; are nothing further off from seeking the Lord and finding mercy from him then the other. These did manifest themselves unworthy of eternall life; doe not all so, who stumble at the Word of God, and refuse to hearken to it? For this is the condemnation of the world, Light is come into the world, and men loved darknesse rather then light, because their deeds were evil, *Joh. 3. 16.* Will you therefore inferre, that all such are inabled to obey it, which is as much to say, as that they are inabled to beleve and repent?

The eighth is out of *Mat. 23. 37, 38.* How often would I have gathered thy children together, as the hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not? Behold your habitation is left unto you desolate, &c. What I pray you, is to bee gathered under his wings? can it bee lesse then to come unto him? nay, is it not to bee healed by him? since as your selfe observe, healing

No power in Man naturally,

was under his wings: and if so, to come to Christ, is to bee healed by him: can it bee any thing lesse, then to beleeeve and repent? And will you here hence inferre that they had power thus to come under his wings, and consequently to beleeeve and repent?

And yet in this very place you professe that as touching all others except the Elect, *God deprives them of those drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance*, Nay, whatsoever it bee, that lies in their power to perform besides, by the performing of it, doe they come any whit neerer to the participation of Grace? I do not finde you adventure to professe so much, for feare of falling into that which you call ungracious Pelagianisme.

The ninth is *Luk. 19. 41, 42.* Which is of the same nature, and of no greater force then the former, *Oh that thou hadst even known at the least in this thy day those things which belong unto thy peace; but now are they hid from thine eyes. For the daies shall come upon thee when thy enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and make thee even with the ground, because thou knewest not the season of thy visitation.* To know, in Scripture phrase is of a complicate notion and signifyeth knowledge joyned with congruous affections: and thus to know the things that belong unto our peace, is so to know, as therewithall to imbrace them; and to know the time of our visitation, is so to know, as to accommodate our selves thereto in agreeable conversation, as *Jer. 8. 7. The Stork in the aire is said to know her appointed times, and the Turtle, and the Crane; and the Swallow (are said) to observe the time of their coming.* That is, so to know it, as accordingly to come: so to know the time of our visitation, is so to know it, as accordingly to come unto God when hee visites us, and according as his Visitation requires of us. Now will you here hence inferre, that they were inabled to perform all this, and so to seek the Lord? I appeale to your own conscience, whether it might not bee as justly said of them, as *Moses said of the children of Israel in the wildernesse, Dent. 29. 4. The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and eares to heare, unto this day.* Nay, doth not our Saviour himself say as much of these Jews, *Job. 12. 39. Therefore they could not beleeeve, because that Esaias saith again. 40. Hee hath blinded their eyes,*

eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their hearts, and should bee converted, and I should heale them. Neither will it follow hereupon that they are excusable so much the more, although this is a very plausible inference, for our Saviour professeth (notwithstanding this) that *they had no cloak for their sins*, John 15. 22. And indeed onely such an inability doth excuse, as whereby a man is unable to doe that which hee fain would doe. As for the doing of that they did in resisting the Gospel, they had rather too much will therein then too little, and that through the want of grace.

For as *Austin* wisely observes: *Libertas sine gratia non est libertas, sed contumacia*. Liberty without grace, is not liberty, but wilfulness.

The tenth is, *Ezek. 24. 13. Because I would have purged thee, and thou wast not purged, thou shalt not bee purged from thy filthinesse, till I have caused my wrath to light upon thee*. I should think this were spoken of Gods Elect, not so much by observing that phrase, *till I have caused my wrath to light upon thee*, but chiefly by comparing it with *Ezek. 22. 10. I will scatter thee among the heathen, and disperse thee in the Countries, and will cause thy filthinesse to depart from thee*. It may have place, not onely of the Elect, but of the regenerate also, for even them sometimes God doth cause to erre from his wayes, and harden their hearts against his feare. Which though they have power to repent, yet upon supposition of obduration, and so long as that continues, it may bee said that they cannot repent. How much more may it bee verifed of naturall men, in the state of unregeneracy, that they cannot repent? And shall this any way hinder the course of Gods judgements against them for their sins unrepented of, because without grace it is not in their power to purge themselves from their sins by repentance? I deny not but they have power to performe feigned repentance, as *Jer. 3. 10*. And shall feigned repentance (think you) bee of force to keep off the judgments of God? or if Gods judgements shall have their course, except they bee prevented by unfeigned repentance, will it herehence follow that naturall men are inabled to perform unfeigned repentance?

El. 63. 17.

The eleventh is *Prov. 1. 20. to 30. Wisdom cryeth, &c. 20 How*

Ff 2

lung

No power in Man naturally,

long will yee love foolishnesse? ver. 22. Turn you at my correction, ver. 23. Because I have called and yee have refused, &c. ver. 24. I will also laugh at your destruction, ver. 28. Will you herehence infer that they were enabled to turn, to hearken to wisdoms voyce, and think to put a difference betwixt your opinion, and that of the *Pelagians* of old, by saying that though naturall men have not power to beleeve and repent, yet they are inabled to doe more good then they doe, in the way of seeking the Lord and finding mercy from him? and pin upon every place you alledge, such a distinction as this, which you no where manifest sufficiently to understand your selfe, as touching the latter part of it; So loath you are to shew what are the particulars of seeking the Lord, they doe attain to, and to what particulars further they might attain, and of what particulars they must necessarily fall short, for want of certain helps.

Might you not as well infer, that it is in the power of man to make him a new heart, because God calls upon him to make him a new heart? *Austin* was wont to say and advise rather in this manner. *In precepto cognosce quid debeat habere, in correptione cognosce tuo te vitio non habere, in oratione cognosce unde possis habere.* In Gods precept know what you ought to have, in his rebuke take notice that through your fault you have it not, in prayer know whence you may have it.

The twelfth is out of 2 Chron. 36. 15, 16. And the Lord God of their fathers sent unto them by his Messengers, rising early and sending, for hee had compassion on his people, and on his habitation. 16. But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his Prophets, untill the wrath of God rose against his people, and till there was no remedy. I doe not deny but that it was in their power not to misuse the Prophets, nor to mock his Messengers, but doe you not think, that amongst these naughty figges, some were nothing so bad, and yet did not the wrath of God come upon them as well as upon others.

Again, consider, what of all this; yet if they had repented, had not their foulest sins hereupon been done away? so that for want of repentance, the wrath of God brake forth against them. Now why doe you not as well infer herehence, that they had

had power to repent, and so to seek after the Lord, and find mercy from him?

Thirdly, was it not enough to bring the wrath of God upon them, to bee found guilty of despising his words, and hath any naturall man power to keep himself from this sin? Is there any greater despising of them, then to esteem so basely of them, as to account them no better then foolishnesse? Now is any naturall man free from this? Doth not the Holy Ghost tell us, *1 Cor. 2. 14. The naturall man perceives not the things of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him?* But by the way I observe, wee little agree in the notion of free will; which (if I bee not deceived) was never accounted by the Learned, to consist in ought other then in election of means. As for the end, according to the habituall disposition of the heart and will, a man is necessarily carryed to the affection of an agreeable end, agreeable, I say, to his own disposition. Whence it followeth, that albeit it bee in the power of grace alone, to change the heart and renew the will, yet whatsoever the unregenerate either doe or refuse to doe, they carry themselves herein freely, in as much as they proceed herein with choyce in respect of their own ends.

I come to the thirteenth out of *Hos. 11. 4. I led them with cords of a man, and with bands of love, and I was to them as hee that taketh away the yoke from their jawes, and I laid their meate unto them.* Was not such like the Lords dealing with the children of *Israel*, when hee took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of *Egypt*? Did hee not leade them with the cords of Love? did hee not take off the yoke from their jawes? did hee not lay Manna before them? yet of them doth *Moses* professe, that notwithstanding all this; *God gave them not an heart to perceive, nor eyes to see, nor eares to heare unto that day.* And in this Text alledged, what colour is there to justify this your distinction; namely, that albeit God deprives Reprobates of those drawing and effectuall means, without which none can come to faith and repentance, yet they are enabled by him to doe much more then they doe, in seeking after the Lord, and finding mercy from him.

Deut. 29. 4

The fourteenth is out of *Esa. 5. 3, 4, 5. Judge I pray you between mee and my vineyard. 4. What could I have done more to*

No power in Man naturally,

my Vineyard, that I have not done unto it & why have I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wilde grapes? 5. And now I will tell you what I will doe to my vineyard. I conceive herein you may devise a treble ground to build upon. I could with your self had dealt plainely, and argued herehence, the justification of your premised distinction. It might have saved your Reader a great deale of paines, wherea's now by the manner of your Discourse, hee is driven as well to argue for you, as to answer for himself, that hee may keep himself from being overtaken with error upon a generall consideration ere hee is aware.

The first ground may bee, that *God seems to professe, that hee had done what hee could doe*; now undoubtedly hee could give them power to doe more good then they did, in the way of seeking the Lord, which is the thing that you affirm, and therefore hee did give this power: but say I, God could give means also to draw effectually unto repentance; and consequently hee did draw them hereunto, which is the thing that your self deny, and the Text it self also, for instead of sweet grapes, they brought forth wilde grapes.

Secondly, you may ground upon this, that God expected they should bring forth sweet grapes, and upon such grounds you usually make collections, and herehence you may infer, that therefore they had power to bring forth sweet grapes. But this consequent is untrue by your opinion; for sweet grapes must needs bee gratefull unto God, and no lesse then Faith and Repentance. But you confesse that *God deprives them of such drawing and effectual means without which none can come, and with which none ever failed to come to faith and repentance.*

The third ground may bee Gods resolution to lay his vineyard waste. And thence you may infer that they had power to avoid such sins as were the causes thereof. But consider, I pray you, is it not just with God to damne the world for infidelity and impenitency, and will you herehence infer that it was in their power to beleeve and repent? I presume you will not.

The fifteenth is *Job 33. 14. to the 18. there wee read that God speaketh once and twice, and one seeth it not, even in dreams and visions of the night. 15. When this will not serve the turn, hee opens the*

the eares of man, even by the corrections which hee hath sealed, ver. 16. and that which God aimes at in this is, That hee might cause man to turn away from his enterprise, and that hee might bide the pride of man, ver. 17. and keepe back his soule from the pit, and that his life should not passe by the Sword, ver. 18. All this represents the power of Gods grace in overcoming the hardnesse of mans heart, together with the wisdome of God, proceeding various wayes to the same end, an instance whereof wee have in *Manasses*. But as for any power in man to doe any more good then hee doth in seeking after the Lord, here is not the least indication, much lesse to iustifie the distinction here devised by you.

I come to the last, taken out of *Job. 16. 8. 9.* *And when hee is come hee will reprove the world of sin, because they beleaved not in mee.* It seems you insist onely upon the latter, in as much as the allegation reacheth no further. The other parts being explicated in the Verses following. Cannot Christ reprove the world of infidelity, for not beleeving in him, unlesse thereby hee acknowledged a power in a carnall man to doe more good then hee doth, in the way of seeking the Lord? Surely, if any power in man hereto is to be acknowledged, it must be a power to beleeve in Christ; seeing infidelity is the sin whereof the world shall be reprov'd by Christ; and not the sin of not doing the good they could in the way of seeking the Lord.

But your self acknowledge in this section that God deprives them of those drawing and effectuell means without which none can come to Faith and Repentance. Much lesse doth it prove your present distinction, namely, that albeit God deprives them of such means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance; yet they are inabled to doe more good then they doe, in the way of seeking the Lord.

Means of the knowledge of God, wee confesse to be partly the administation of his providence in his works, which is the book of his creatures; and there was a time when God did teach the world *διὰ τεργμάτων*, by his Works, as *Chrysostome* observeth, and not *διὰ γεγραμμένων*, by his Writings, and partly by the revelation of his word in the Scriptures. And one of these meanes ever was and is afforded unto all. But whereas
you

Means of the knowledge of God,

you say God affords them to this end to lead them to salvation and repentance. Here is first an incongruity, which you are content to swallow, to hold up your opinion. For in truth the administration of Gods Providence in his works, and the revelation of himself in his word, is the very leading of them to that whereunto hee leads them, to wit, by admonition. And as it is absurd to say that God doth admonish men to the end hee may admonish them: so is it no lesse absurd to say, that hee doth lead them, to the end hee may lead them. As for the things whereof hee doth admonish them repentance and salvation are ill matched. And even such an incongruity doth serve your turn, to blear both your own eyes and others also. If these were the things God leads men to by his works, and word, it were but in this manner, hee leads them to repentance that they may bee saved.

As for repentance it self, admonition hereof the Apostle doth so manifestly attribute in such sort unto the ministry of his word as withall hee derogates it from the bare administration of his providence in his works, *Act. 17. 30.* *And the time of this ignorance God regarded not, but now bee admonisheth all men every where to repent;* manifestly giving to understand that the Gentiles were not admonished till now. In the time of extraordinary affliction, brought upon them by the administration of Gods providence in his works, men may bee stricken with feares that they have provoked a divine providence, and hereupon they may bee stirred up to take a course to pacifie the wiath of God according to that counsell. *Non te nullius exerceat numinis ira, &c.* therefore *faciles venerare Napæas: namque dabunt veniam votis irasque remittent.*

But when they neither know God whom they have offended; nor the sinne whereby they have provoked him, nor the right way to pacifie him; (as a Jew sometimes being taken in a foule fact of collusion, with the place where hee had been kindly intreated, and desiring to make remonstrance of his repentance, out of his familiarity with mee, came to mee privately, and inquired of mee what it was to repent, for saith hee, I doe fast and macerate my body.)

This manner of admonition deserves not to bee called an admonition to repentance. In such a case the *Albenians* were some-

sometimes brought about to erect an Altar to an unknown God; as much as to say, to pacifie they knew not whom, nor how, nor for what.

It is true, God is said *Rom. 1. 19.* to manifest to the Gentiles that which may bee known of him, by his works. Yet not all that may bee known of him, for even the wisdom of the world, after all their paines and studious courses, are said not to have known God, no not in the wisdom of God, *1 Cor. 1. 21.* But his eternall power and God-head is generally made known to the world, sufficiently to convict them of Idolatry: and the Apostle delivers no more in that place.

I hope wee Christians by the help of Gods Word, are now adades brought to such a measure of understanding of God by his workes, that wee are able even by discourse of reason to prove many a faire attribute of God, which the greatest Philosophers were ignorant of, though some things are found in them concerning the nature of God, which wee cannot read without admiration.

You adde also that God hath made manifest that which may bee known of him by his Law (also) written in their hearts. These you couple together, though little or nothing Homogeneall. The Law of God written in our hearts, is concerning mans duty, no part whereof is contained in his Works.

His eternall power and God-head the Apostle tels us is made manifest by his workes, no such content doth hee make of the Law written in our hearts, *Rom. 2. 14.* but when you say this is done to this end to move them to seek after the Lord, you fall upon the incongruity formerly spoken of. For the very administration of Gods providence, is the moving of them to seek after the Lord.

I say the administration of Gods providence in his workes, moves men, as the Apostle signifies, to seek after the Lord. The Apostle no where refers this to the Law written in mens hearts; but you put all together, and that for a speciall purpose as it serves. For the phrase of seeking after the Lord, *Act. 17.* seemes onely to import the seeking after his nature, manifested by his workes; but you desire (as it seemes) to bend it to denote such a seeking after the Lord, as whereby to pacifie

him, and to finde mercy from him. In which sense you say it was farre more accomodable to the Law of God written in mans heart, then to the Administation of his providence in his works; and therefore you couple both these courses together, and then assign the end of them both, to seek after the Lord; which through the ambiguous signification thereof, is applicable to both; though the Apostle utters it in such a sense onely, as whereby it is applyed to one course onely, namely to the administation of his providence in his works. Which yet I doe not conceive to proceed from any ill minde in you, but out of a desire to hold our tenets up in that course of opinion which pleaseth us, which is a common fault of all.

But with this difference; some affect those opinions, which are most fit to humour flesh and blood: but your aime (I am perswaded) is onely to take a fit course to justifie God in his proceedings. Only you may bee pleased to remember, that it is nothing fit, wee should *lie for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him.*

As for the other end here specified, of *Leading to Repentance*; this is neither appliable to that course of Gods providence, mentioned *Act. 17.* which is admonishing to seek the Lord, nor to that, *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* but to a course different from both, namely, the consideration of Gods patience and long-suffering, which yet without Gods word to inform us better, is far more fit to harden mens hearts in their sinfull courses, then to bring them to repentance. Which is a good reason to perswade, that in this second Chapter to the *Romans*, the Apostle makes a transition from the Gentiles to the Jews, from them which were nurtured and disciplined onely by Gods works, to them which were nurtured also by the Ministry of his word. That in *Job 33. 17, 29.* of *with-drawing men from their courses, healing their pride, and saving their soules from the pit*; You doe not well to confound the courses taken for this there mentioned, with the bare administation of Gods providence in his works, or the writing of his Law in mens hearts, after a naturall manner. For the courses there mentioned *by dreams and visions*, and *by an interpreter*, were in those dayes the onely meanes of grace. And then *Elihu* speaks of Gods effectuall working

working of these gracious operations: to wit, *In withdrawing men from their sinfull courses*; to heale their pride, and save their soules from the pit. And wee can willingly grant, that God did intend that which hee would effectually bring to passe. But to say that God doth intend and will, that such a thing should come to passe; which never comes to passe, this wee take to bee a most indecent assertion, and spoiles God of his omnipotency, and plainly contradictions to that which your self here professe, in saying that God deprives the men of this world, of those drawing and effectuell means, without which none can come to Faith and Repentance. And with what sobriety can it bee affirmed, that God wills their repentance and salvation, whom hee deprives of those means, without which none can repent, that hee may bee saved? Yet for the making good of your assertion, I have often devised a commodious interpretation of your words, which you doe not, as namely thus; God useth such or such means to withdraw men from their course, to heal their pride, to save them from the pit. That is, to admonish them of their duty in turning from their wicked wayes, and humbling themselves, that they may bee saved. And accordingly God may be said to will it, with will of precept, not of purpose, *Voluntate precepti, non propositi*; untill withall hee doth effect it, by giving those drawing and effectuell meanes, without which none can repent.

Or lastly, God may bee said, by using such courses to intend, that they should repent, and so bee saved, that is, that they should (*Ex officio*, not *de facto*) repent, that they might bee saved. Thus to the Israelites hee did, and to his Church *Ezek. 24. 13.* hee doth even to reprobates amongst them; offer meanes of grace to purge them. Now by the operations of outward means, (which I think you signifie) and if you thereby comprehend the inward operation of Gods Spirit also, you doe not well to confound things so different under the same termes, (such ambiguity is so apt to deceive us) consists only in instruction, and admonition, and exhortation or correction. Now these whether made to *turn us, Prov. 1. 23.* or to *gather us, Mat. 23. 27.* or to *convince us, Job. 16. 8, 9.* are not of themselves (as you know) effectuell to the conversion of any; though they are called in Scripture phrase, the drawing of us with the

The sufficiency of the means

cords of a man, and with the bonds of love, *Hos. 11. 4.* And the dressing of us, *Esa. 5. 4.* And your selfe professe, that unlesse God use those drawing and effectuall means, no man can convert, no man can beleeve and repent.

Secondly, when you say, that the means which God useth for these ends, are in some measure sufficient (if they bee not hindered by men) to bring them to the attainment of these things. This is worse then ought you have delivered hitherto; yet you are to bee commended for dealing so plainly as you doe in this place, and no where else for ought I have found. But the more plainly you deale, the more foule doth your opinion appeare. I shold with a distinction, willingly confesse that the means God useth are sufficient, to wit, in the way of instruction and admonition, so farre forth as God will have them (towards whom they are used) to bee instructed and admonished: But this kinde of sufficiency doth not depend on man, as if hee could hinder it.

Whether they will receive any instruction or no, the means are never a whit lesse or more sufficient in the way of instruction.

And indeed outward means tend no further, then to such like operations as thus, (to wit) instruction, admonition, correction.

But when you make the sufficiency of the means to depend on mans will, so as to bee hindered thereby, this must needs bee delivered of sufficiency in respect of conversion, of bringing men unto faith and repentance.

And withall this is further to imply, that it is in the power of man by these means to bee converted unto God to beleeve and repent: which is a more foule tenet, then any you have delivered yet, though little truth hitherto have I found in this Discourse throughout, saving in things merely delivered to no purpose. And withall it is plainly contradictory to that which here you expressly professe, namely, that no man can beleeve and repent without some drawing and effectuall means, which are far different from the means here spoken of. For the meanes here spoken of, are such as hee affords to Reprobates: but those drawing and effectuall means, which hee affords onely to his Elect, as your selfe doe acknowledge;

wee

wee are so farre from denying them to bee sufficient to the ends whereto hee intends them, as that wee willingly professe, they are all effectuall (in their kinde) unto the ends, whereto hee intends them.

As for example, if God intends them for the converting of some unto God, all such shall certainly bee converted; if onely to the taking away of excuse from others, they shall bee effectuall to the removing of excuse; if to the bringing of some *ad exteriorē vite emendationem*, to an outward amendment of life and no further, they shall bee effectuall to that also and no further. And therefore wee doe nothing derogate from the wisdom of God, but look you well unto it, that you doe not derogate from Gods omnipotency whilest you maintain that some things are intended by God, which are never brought to passe, and that because the will of man forsooth stands in resistance unto Gods intention. Directly contrary to the Discourse of *Austin, Enchir. cap. 96.* whose words are these, *Deo proculdubio, quam facile est quod vult facere, tam facile est, quod non vult esse, non sinere. Hoc nisi credamus, periclitatur ipsum nostre fidei confessionis initium, quia nos in Deum Patrem omnipotentem credere consistimus. Neque enim ob aliud veraciter vocatur omnipotens, nisi quia quicquid vult potest, nec voluntate cuiusquam creature voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus.* And if it bee so as you professe; That no man can come to Christ, except the Father draw him; by the same Almighty authority and power, whereby hee sent Christ into the world; and withall if you adde thereunto, as else-where you doe, that *this power* (I leave out authority as of an alien signification) *is shewed onely in drawing his Elect*; what need all these paines that you have taken, since it is cleare, that so long as you hold to this, you shall never satisfie any Pelagian or Arminian? and all the absurdities they charge our Doctrine with, are directed against this.

But well you may puzzle the wits, and trouble the minde of many an Orthodox and well-affected Christian, with so intricate a discourse, labouring to devise a new way to justifie our Doctrine of Election by so tempering the Doctrine of reprobation, as utterly to overthrow your own Orthodox opinion, in the very point of election, as I have already shewed, as occasion hath been given.

Sufficiency in the means, and

Object. How then (will you say) can these two stand together? there is a sufficiency and power in the meanes, to lead the men of this world to the knowledge of God, and to grace in Christ, and yet there is an impotency, yea an impossibility in the men of the world to come to Christ, without greater and stronger means then these bee?

Ans. For answer whereto I will not content my self to say, that these means are sufficient, because they suffice to leave men without excuse; onely in the second place, and by accident, after, when men have neglected to make so good use of them as they might have done: but you see that God aimes at other ends in the first and principall place. *viz.* to lead them to repentance to save their soules from the pit, as the places alledged give evident witnesse: and for these ends it is that these means must bee acknowledged and conceived as sufficient. For else the Word of God argued an imperfection or insufficiency of such meanes to their proper ends. I think it safe to say, these means are sufficient, *ex parte Dei*, on Gods behalf, to manifest the will of God, rather to desire repentance and life, then the hardning and destruction of the Creature. And *ex parte hominum*, in regard of men, sufficient to inable them to the performance of such duties, in which their naturall consciences would excuse them, and in which way they might the sooner finde mercy, mercy vouchsafing more powerfull and more effectuall helps, whilest they walk according to the knowledge and helps, which they have received, and sin not against conscience, but only out of ignorance in the state of unbelief.

Exam.

It is *Arminius* his superfiary conceit, that *Horatio non facta sed spr.ta*, makes a man inexcusable, not considering that admonition and instruction it self, takes away excuse, although none have need of excuse, but they that doe evill. For the excuse is this, *si scissem fecissem*, or, *si audissem credidissem*; now this excuse is manifestly removed by the preaching of the Gospel. And the word inexcusable, though it formally signifie without excuse, yet withall it connotes a condition delinquent, and such as had need of excuse, though bereaved thereof, and such a condition ariseth from the contempt of the means of grace.

Neither is this condition by accident, like as the neglecting

ing to make good use of them is not by accident.

For God intending to deprive them of those drawing and effectuall helps, without which none can make good use of them, did never intend they should make good use of them, but rather the contrary, inasmuch as hee purposed not to shew that mercy towards them which hee shews towards his Elect, but rather to harden them. As the Lord tells Ezek. Chap. 2.

4. *They are impudent children, and stiffe-hearted. I doe send thee unto them, and thou shalt say unto them; Thus saith the Lord God. But surely they will not heare, neither indeed will they cease; for they are a rebellious house, yet shall they know, that there hath been a Prophet among them.*

So that albeit the Lord knew full well what sorry entertainment his Prophets should finde, yet would hee not give way to any such excuse as this; If the Lord had sent his Prophet to admonish us of our wandrings from him wee would soon have turned unto the good way of the Lord.

No, they shall know there hath been a Prophet among them.

And as for the ground of this his fore-knowledge, *Esa* manifesteth this to bee Gods purpose to harden them, *Esa. 6. 9. Goe and say unto this people, yee shall heare indeed, but shall not understand, yee shall plainly see and not perceive; make the heart of this people fat, and make their eares heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and heare with their eares, and understand with their hearts, and convert, and I shall heale them.* What place is here for such conceites of leaving men without excuse in a second place, and that by accident?

Yet if you can prove that God did intend any better thing unto them in a first place, wee shall bee willing to confesse that this comes in, in a second place.

You say, God leads them to repentance to save them from the pit.

I answer this leading to repentance, *Rom. 2.* is onely his sparing them in their sins, and admonishing them to repent; and this wee say is done to the Reprobates, not with any purpose to bring them to repentance: for if God had any such purpose, hee would not deprive them of those helps without which none can come to repentance as your self professe hee doth: and if hee had any such purpose to bring them to repentance.

The sufficiency of Gods Word.

penitance and yet doth not, it followeth that hee cannot.

And if hee hath any such purpose, either this purpose must continue still in God, even after their damnation, or otherwise God must bee charged with mutability, all which you consider not, much lesse accommodate any tolerable answer thereto.

For the same reason I deny that God hath any intention or purpose to save them: how can hee? considering that from everlasting hee hath ordained them to condemnation.

And of this also you take no notice, much lesse goe about to shape any convenient answer thereunto; carrying the matter all along in such manner, as if Gods decree of their condemnation were not conceived, untill the means of Grace offered are found to bee finally despised.

Neither doe the places alledged by you, give any testimony to these your uncouth assertions, much lesse evident testimony. Indeed I blame you not for desiring your Reader would take them so, to save your paines of proving it. For you take no pains at all to inforce any place, by Logically argumentation to give evidence to such a sense you put upon them, though it stand in manifest opposition to the nature of God even to the bereaving him both of his omnipotency and immutability, to make him to contradict himself, and strangely to go about to perswade the world that God intends the repentance of those men, to whom hee denies those helps, without which none can repent, as your self also acknowledge.

So that wee need not to bee put to deny the sufficiency of Gods word to those ends whereunto God hath given it, which is to instruct in all points of Faith and duties of life; and to admonish us to give obedience unto it, and reprove them that doe not; and consequently to take away all excuse for want of any of these gracious operations. And thus it is sufficient *ex parte Dei*, and *ex parte hominum* too, as for God to admonish thereby, and men to bee admonished and instructed.

But otherwise to require any thing on mans part to adde sufficiency to God, is too too absurd.

For whether man doth yeeld obedience, the word is never a whit the more sufficient, or whether hee yeelds not obedience, the word is never the lesse sufficient.

God desires not the repentance of Reprobates.

233

As for the desire of the Repentance and life of Reprobates which you attribute unto God, you keep your course I confesse in strange expressions, manifestly contradictory to the nature of God, and to your self.

Can you perswade your self that ever the world will bee brought about to beleve, or any intelligent or sober man amongst them, that God desires the repentance and life of them, whom hee hath determined from everlasting to deprive of those helps without which no man can repent and bee saved? yet that hee doth deprive them hereof, it is your own most expresse profession in the former Section.

As for hardning them; doth hee not harden whom hee will? and hath hee not from everlasting ordained all Reprobates unto destruction? As for any desire hereof in God, I account it a very absurd thing, to treat of any will in God under the notion of desire in proper speech; Speak wee of the desires of weak men, who cannot effect what they will; but bee advised to spare to attribute any desires to God in proper speech, as you would spare to attribute to him, eyes and ears, and hands, and heart, in proper speech, and though God bee pleased in condescension to our capacities to take upon him our infirmities, let us not recompence his goodnesse so ill, as to conceive of his nature as obnoxious to the same imperfections whereto our natures are: When you say that the Word inables not onely the Elect, but others to perform such duties, and having but erst spoken of the duty of repentance, and this being delivered in the same breath, whereto doth this tend, but to work in your Reader an opinion, that even Reprobates are inabled by the Word to perform the duty of Repentance? which you know full well cannot bee affirmed by you without palpable contradiction to your self, as well as to the truth of God, and therefore I wonder not a little what you mean to carry your self in this your Discourse in such sort as to draw so neere to such foule assertions. Therefore you forbear to name particularly the duty of Repentance, but flee to generalls and say that even Reprobates are inabled by the Word, to perform such duties in which their naturall conscience would excuse them.

And I confesse that, as *Pam* hath taught mee, even without

H h

the

the word naturall men are inabled to doe some duties wherein their naturall conscience doth excuse them, as namely, in doing the things contained in the Law, and that by nature, mark that well, I beseech you, that you may see the uncouthnesse of that which follows, as when you say, And in that way they sooner finde mercy. For what? is a man by nature able to perform some things whereby hee may the sooner finde mercy? Was ever mercy found at the hand of God by performing some duty by power of nature? What revelation of God hath taught you this? that a work of nature should further us to obtaining the mercy of God? I speak of morall works of nature, not of naturall, such as are to goe to Church and to heare a Sermon; to goe, and to heare, are actions naturall, not morall, unless they bee considered as joyned with affections and intentions morall. And to go to Church and heare a Sermon, with ill affections and intentions, as namely either to mock, or to take a nap, is a naturall way I confesse, whereby a man may and doth finde mercy farre sooner, then by keeping at home, though never so civilly employed. And therefore Father *Latimer* reprehending some for comming to Church to take a nap, yet saith hee, let them come, for they may bee taken napping; which is as much as to say, they may finde mercy at the hands of God whilst they are napping.

Yet I presume you will not say, that so to come to Church, is the performing of a duty whereby they may finde mercy sooner.

In the next place you indirectly imbrace the sower leaven of Arminianisme, plainly professing that God doth vouchsafe more powerfull effectuall helps to them that walk according to the knowledge and helps they have received. As if that of our Saviour *Habenti dabitur*, to him that hath shall bee given, you did interpret especially after the same manner, as *Arminius* doth, to wit, that if men use their naturals right, God will give them means of grace; But here is the difference, they speak their minds plainly, you carry your Discourse so, that wee are driven to groape (as in the dark) after your meaning. For you deliver this of Reprobates, who doe already enjoy the Word, the means of grace; And therefore

fore the more powerfull helps you speak of, are not outward means, (for that they enjoy already) but inward grace. As if God had ordained that grace should bee given according unto works, which is direct Pelagianisme. And withall you imply a power in Reprobates to walk according to knowledge, and helps already received, to wit, under the means of grace; And what can this bee lesse, then a power to beleve and repent. How many a godly mans heart would bleed to understand so foule assertions to drop from the pen of such a man as your self?

In fine, you adde a new qualification of the way to finde mercy the sooner, and that is, not to sin against conscience, but onely of ignorance, and withall by the coherence imply, that even reprobates and unregenerate persons have power to keep themselves from sinning against their conscience, and so to keep themselves as to sin onely through ignorance. Whence it manifestly followeth, that in such a case of performance which you esteem possible, either the conscience of a naturall man shall not convict him of any sin, or convicting him of sin, shall not convict him, that hee ought to repent of it.

Or lastly, it followeth, that hee hath power to repent. The two first are unreasonable; to affirm the last, is to contradict your self, having lately professed, that *God deprives all save his Elect of those helps and means, without which none can repent.* And truly it seems, in denying the power of repenting unto the world, you did not well consider what you delivered; for the face of your Discourse seemsto lead to the contrary, namely, to the maintaining that it is in the power of a naturall man to repent though hee bee in the state of unbeleeve.

Where again, in signifying that you speak of a man in the state of unbeleeve, you confound, if not your self (yet) I am sure your Reader. For but erst you discoursed how men of the world are inabled by Gods Word to the performance of such duties in which their naturall conscience would excuse them. Now I should think, they that enjoy the Word of God, and are thereby so inabled as you speak, are not to bee accounted in the state of unbeleeve, which I should think is a state peculiar unto heathens, who have not so much as an outward profession of Christianity. In like sort it is your course

The insufficiency of the Means

to confound the inward operation of Gods Spirit with the outward means, and comprehend them both under the terms of means and helps, which have no univocall notion common unto them. It is bad enough to hold ones self to generalls; considering, that may bee verified of onespecies which cannot bee verified of another, but it is too too bad to confound those under generall termes, that have no more univocation between them then creation, and exhortation.

Another confusion I finde abuseth your fancy in this very Section, and that is spread all over it like a Leprosie. For whereas the objection arising naturally from the former discourse, is grounded upon a seeming contradiction, in professing a naturall man to bee impotent to perform faith and repentance; and yet giving power to a man to attaine those ends, whereunto the means given tend, namely, to his conversion and salvation: instead of comparing the sufficiency you give to man with the sufficiency you deny to man, and therewithall shewing how the one doth not contradict the other; I say instead of comparing these, you compare the sufficiency of the means with the impotency of man, to convert and bee saved; which you expresse by comming to Christ. Varying your phrales at every turn, which is good for nothing but to trouble disputation. Whereas Indeed there is no question to bee made of the sufficiency of the means, (if by means you understand the word of the Gospel) in that kinde, wherein means are capable of sufficiency, to wit, in the way of instruction, exhortation, reprehension, beyond which kinde of operations their sufficiency doth not extend.

The question is onely of the sufficiency of man to perform what the means doe move us unto.

I confesse under means you comprehend, not only the book of grace, which is Gods word, but the book of Nature also, which is Gods works, the sufficiency whereof to inform either, as touching the nature of God or duty of man, wee utterly deny, neither are you able to prove. And therefore you doe not so well to carry it in the generall, seeing as touching the specials, it is true of the one, not of the other. And in such cases the issue of generalls, is rather to circumvent a simple Reader then to inform.

And

And yet as touching that undue comparison by you made, and formerly mentioned; you doe not carry it so cleanly, but that by the way you supplant your self; as when you speak of the sufficiency of the means, to the ends formerly mentioned, except they bee hindered by men. For it cannot bee understood of bringing a man passively to those ends, to wit, unto repentance. For man neither is nor can bee merely passive in repentance, but must bee active also. Nay, for ought I see, you make him passive therein, onely in respect of instruction, and exhortation, which nothing hinders, but that hee may bee altogether active in performing repentance, if hee will. Sith then repentance is the end whereto these means tend, and the means are sufficient to bring any to repentance (as you avouch) except they bee hindred by men, it must necessarily follow, that man hath power by these means to attain to these ends whereto these means lead him, if hee will; and consequently hath power to repent, and to obtain grace in Christ, if hee will; for the means lead hereunto, namely, to the knowledge of God and grace in Christ, as your self have professed in expresse terms.

And consequently when you say to the contrary, that there is an impotency, yea, an impossibility in the men of this world to come to Christ, without greater and stronger means then these bee: you doe directly contradict your self, neither will all the labour following, expressing your selfe in various phrasologies, serve turn to free you from this contradiction, but leave men suspicious that you affirm this contradiction onely in words, but the contrary potency, you maintain in deed. And because that without all tergiversation you professe, that such men have power to perform something, upon the performance whereof they might the sooner finde mercy; I beseech you in the feare of God no longer to abuse your self and others in speaking thus indefinitely, but tell us plainly and particularly, what that is which (you say) Reprobates have power to perform, and upon the performance whereof they should finde mercy. To confesse my bold weaknesse, ingenuously I am perswaded you are not able to define any such particular; if you should, it will not satisfie to the full, unlesse withall you explicate your self; and shew whether that work you speake

of bee a worke of nature, or a work of grace; If a work of grace, then an unregenerate man is not so farre dead in sin, but hee is able to perform a work of grace, and if hee bee able to perform one work of grace, why not two, why not twenty? If a work of nature onely, then seeing hereupon you say hee shall finde mercy, you fall foule upon that which was censured in the Synod of *Palestine*, one thousand two hundred years agoe, namely, that grace is given according unto works. If some may say on your behalf, that you doe not say they shall finde mercy in this case, but onely that they shall the sooner finde mercy: or if this like not, if any shall otherwise plead in this manner: namely, that you doe not say that hee shall finde mercy in this case, but hee might finde mercy: I will bid him content himself, and expect while you warrant such Apologies, and then I doubt not, but hee shall waite long enough, for I am confident you are farre off from maintaining such foule collusions.

By the way give mee leave to wonder that you expresse your self in such a manner. But alas, what should wee look for when the cause is no better? and yet a gracious respect unto a gracious end, namely, the justifying of Gods proceedings, hath cast a good man upon such a course. So dangerous a thing it is when a man is to seek in some particulars, not to content himself with acknowledgment thereof, and to waite upon God for a time of revelation, but to cut out his own way in seeking satisfaction.

Ans.

Rom. I. 21. 28.

Thirdly, the men of this world doe not walk answerably to the means they have received, neither doe they imploy or use these talents to such advantage as they might. The Gentiles though they knew God, yet they glorified him not as God, but became unthankfull and vain in their imaginations, they did not like to retaine God in their knowledge: but to detain the truth in unrighteousnesse.

Act. 7. 51.

Luk. 19. 24.

Mat. 27. 21, 22

Joh. 3. 43.

The Jews resisted the Holy Ghost, despised the messengers and word of God, acknowledged not the day and meanes of their own peace; refusing him and all his benefits, preferring a murderer and false prophet before him, brought forth wilde grapes of injustice and oppression instead of the sweet grapes of righteousness and judgement. In this they abused the talents

lents and meanes of Grace in a worse manner then could bee excused, by any necessity or impotency of corrupt nature. Corrupt nature resisting not, but by these helps they might have avoided these sinnes which they fell into, and might have reached to the performance of these duties; for the neglect of which they are here reproved for comming short of. Yea, *Pilate* himselfe would have brought forth better fruit, then some of these which the Jews yeelded, but that the Jews themselves prevailed with him for worse.

To speake plainly, that phrases doe not deceive us, it is *Exam.* true, that the men of the world doe not live according to their knowledge, nor abstaine from foule sinnes, from which they might abstaine. But what if they did? should they finde mercy the sooner? for unlesse you make this good, you say nothing to the purpose. Therefore to the maintenance of this you tended in the former Section, but all in vaine. For consider; why then did not the Philosophers find mercy, *Plato, Socrates, Phocion*, the most morall men of the world? Again, did any of these abstaine from any foule sinne in a gracious manner, or out of their love to God? Look to *Isocrates* his incitements to morality, what are they other then the reward of praise and applause of the world? and why, I pray you, should God regard them any whit the more for this? nay, did they not look for justification by this? all their goodnesse did they not attribute to their own Free will? and why should not God hate them the more for this? Doe not Publicans and Harlots (and did not our Saviour tell us as much?) enter into the kingdome of Heaven before Scribes and Pharisees? Bee it so, that the men of the world were Fornicators when they might have forborn it: were Idolaters, but might have abstained from that: were Adulterers, Wantons, Buggerers, and might have kept themselves pure from such abominations: were theeves, when they might have abstained from laying hands on their neighbours goods; were covetous, yet might have contemned the world as many did: were Drunkards, yet might have tempered themselves from such excesse: were Railers, yet might have ordered their tongues: were Extortioners, yet might have been more mercifull then so. Now I pray you tell me, were not the elect of God such also? See what.

God calls not according to works.

what the Apostle saith in reference to every one of these particulars, *1 Cor. 6. 11. And such were some of you, but yee are washed, but yee are justified, but yee are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God.* Nay, how many a naturall man was more morall then to be guilty of so foule pollutions, as many of Gods elect have been conscious of, yet never found mercy at the hands of God. If otherwise, God should call men not so much according to his purpose and grace, as according to workes; directly contrary to *Pauls* text, *1 Tim. 1. 9.* And what then should become of that, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardneth?* *Rom. 9. 18.*

As for the fault you mention of the Gentiles, was it not common to the Elect as well as to the Reprobates? What saith *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, *1 Cor. 12. 2. Yee know yee were Gentiles, and were carryed away unto dumb Idols, even as ye were led.* Yet the *Romans* for above a hundred years had no Images, as *Varro* testifies, saying, That then the Gods were worshipped *castius*, more chastly, and that they who brought in Images, *timorem ademerunt, errorem auxerunt*, took away the feare of God, and increased the errour concerning the nature of God: Yet in these dayes of Image-worship, thousands were from Idols turned to serve the living God, *1 Thess. 1. 8.* in those former daies not one that we read of.

Wee come to the Jews; bee it so, that they were worse then *Pilate*, yet many of them in despite of their sinnes were converted unto Christ; I say, of them that crucified him, and preferred a murderer before him; *Pilate* was not: at least wee have a record of the conversion of the one, *Acts 2.* none of the other. Yea *Saul* breathing nothing but wrath and fury against the Church of God, as *Ferox scelerum*—*Quia prima pro- venerant*; being heartned with the blood of *Stephen*, as with a cup of sweet Wine, was converted unto Christ, when many a morall, quiet, peaceable, and nothing factious Jew, had not the mercy shewed him that *Saul* had. They abused (you say) their talents and meanes of grace, in a worse manner then could bee excused (yet who worse then *Saul* or *Manasses*) by any necessity or impotency of corrupt nature. But who I pray, goes about to excuse them this way? wee certainly excuse them not,

no, nor they themselves neither; for it were most incongruous they should, even as if *Epicures* should complain of the sweet morsels which they roule under their tongues, that they are so sweet, that they cannot forbear to bee in love with them. But will you deny God to have a hand in hardning them, to the committing of so foule excesse? what is the meaning of going over to vile affections? to doe things inconvenient, and that in an abominable kind? and that to what end but this, that so they might receive the just recompence of their error? yet that error is well known to have been incident, as well to the very elect of God, as unto Reprobates. By the way you signifie, that by the neglect of the helpes and meanes afforded them, they fell short of these duties, to the performance whereof they might have reached. Their sin was in doing contrary to their knowledge and conscience upon due information out of Gods Word; this is to neglect the meanes; And consequently to use the meanes aright, was to doe accordingly as they were informed. And indeed, if they had done otherwise then they did, they had not done so bad as they did. I finde such giddinesse of discourse usually amongst the *Arminians*; while they satisfie themselves with phrases, never examining particularly, the matter and substance of their own expressions.

Answer.

Because of the abuse of these talents and meanes of grace, God therefore doth deny to the men of this world such powerfull and gracious helpes, as hee vouchsafeth freely to the Elect, to draw them on effectually to repentance and salvation.

The Gentiles abusing the light of nature, God gave them Rom. I. 29. up to vile affections, yea, even to a reprobate minde.

The Pharisees because they employed the talent of their wealth unfaithfully, God would not truit them with the true riches. Luk. 16. 11, 12.

The Jews because they rejected Christ, and his Word, and his Messengers, with scornfull and bitter malignity, and brought forth grapes of gall and wormwood; therefore God took his Word from them, and hid from them the things that did belong unto their peace; hee took the kingdome of God from them, and gavethem as a prey to sinne, and misery, and derision, *Psal.* 81. 11, 12. What if none of the world (as opposed

Acts 16. 46.

Luke 19. 42.

Mat. 21. 41,

42.

to the Elect) ever came to Christ, or made such use of the means and helps offered in him unto them, as to obtaine salvation and regenerating grace by him; yet might they have made better use of the means then they did, which because they did not, it was just with God to deny them greater means, who thus abused the lesser.

Exam.

In all this wee have as pure Arminianisme tendred unto us, as could drop from the pen of *Arminius* himselſe, or *Corvinus*. Yet God forbid wee should *eo nomine*, for that cause dislike it. If truth, wee must embrace it, though it come out of the mouth of the Devill. If falshood, wee shall by Gods grace disclaim it, though it proceed out of the mouth of Angels of light, and not disclaim it onely, but disprove it also. You may as well say that God doth not draw the men of this world effectually to Repentance, because they doe abuse the talents and means of grace, but this I disprove thus.

First, if this bee the cause why God doth not draw them to repentance, then this is the cause why hee sheweth not to them that mercy which hee doth to the Elect; but this is not the cause thereof, which I prove thus. The meer pleasure of God is the cause; therefore that is not. The antecedent thus; God shews mercy on whom hee will, and hardens, (that is, denies mercy) to whom hee will. If to harden were not to deny mercy, it could not stand in opposition to shewing mercy. The consequence I demonstrate thus. If to deny mercy to whom hee will, doth not inferre that mercy is not denied according unto works: then to shew mercy to whom hee will, doth not inferre, that mercy is not shewed according unto works.

Secondly, if mens evill works were the cause why God denies them mercy, then it could not bee said, that God denies mercy, because it is the pleasure of his will to deny it. For if a reason bee demanded why a malefactor is hanged, it were very absurd to answer, that the reason is, because it was the pleasure of the Magistrate to have him hanged.

Thirdly, if evill works bee the deserving cause, why Gods mercy is denied unto men, then either by necessity of nature, or by constitution of God. Not by necessity of nature, in opposition to the constitution of God; for then by necessity of nature,

nature God must bee compelled to deny mercy unto such, what then shall become of Gods Elect? unlessse you will say, that their workes before mercy shewed them, were not so bad as others, which were equally to contradict both experience and the Word of God; For in this case men should have mercy shewed on them, according to their works, to wit, as they were found lesse evill then the works of others. Nor by constitution of God.

For first, shew mee any such constitution, that men in such a condition of evill works shall bee denied mercy.

Secondly, by the same constitution, mercy should bee denied to the Elect also. When you speak of the Gentiles (in this case) abusing the light of Nature, and given over to vile affections, you take your aime miserably amisse: For the Gentiles are not the men of the world in opposition to the Elect. But God forbid, that the Gentiles, and the men of the world, should bee terms convertible in this kinde, for then what should become of us?

Certainly the number of Gods Elect is greater amongst the Gentiles, then among the Jews; and even of those that were given over to vile affections, some were Elect, as appears *1 Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. And to say that the cause why God denies them mercy, was, because they abused the light of nature; I have freshly disproved this, and that evidently, as I presume the intelligent Reader will observe, though the contrary (I confesse) bee very plausible at the first sight, and before wee come to the discussing of it.

Thirdly, you take your aime amisse also (though not in so great measure as in the former) in the phrases: For even of the Pharisees some were Elect, witnesse holy *Paul*; Who abused his zeale of the Law more foully then hee? even to the persecuting of Gods Church? yet was not the true treasure denied to him, and that in the highest measure. And as for Reprobates, if you think their unfaithfulnesse in the use of their wealth, was the cause why mercy was denied them: for the disproofe hereof, I refer mee to my former arguments.

Fourthly, the very Elect of God, not onely rejected Christ for a time, but also crucified him. That which you urge of Gods taking his word and Kingdom (in plain terms the means

of grace) from such a Nation as contemns them, is nothing to the purpose. For wee treat of Gods shewing and denying mercy, not in the means, but as touching the grace it self of Repentance. But this benefit you have confounded, by comprehending both under the name of meanes and helps, for your advantage, to passe from the one to the other, as you see good. Here indeed it is as true, that because men doe make precious account of the means of grace, therefore God continueth these means unto them: like as because of mens perseverance in Faith, and Repentance, and good works, God rewards them with everlasting life; like as because men die in their sins, therefore God inflicts on them everlasting death. Onely with this difference; Sin on the one side is the meritorious cause both of withdrawing the means of grace, and of damnation: but conscionable walking before God in the use of the means, is only the disposing cause both to the continuance of the means, and to eternall salvation. For God by grace makes us meet partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in Light. Forthwith you return to the right state of the question, to wit, in the concession or denegation of regenerating grace, but carry your self in shew very prejudicially to the freeness of Gods grace, as when you say, What if no Reprobate made such use of the means and helps offered as to obtain regenerating grace? Dangerously implying that there is a certain use of the means, *quo posito*, which being put, regenerating grace should bee obtained. As if grace regenerating were to bee dispensed according to an unregenerate persons works. Of the same leaven savour your words following, when you say, *That because they did not make better use of the means, it was just with God to deny them greater means*, saving that here you may bee relieved by the ambiguity of the word means, by shifting from one sense of it to another. For it means bee taken in the same kinde, to wit, of outward means, like as it is just with God to reward the right use of smaller meanes, with the bestowing of greater, so it is just with God, for the abuse of the smaller, not onely to deny greater, but to take away those smaller.

But as touching the granting, or denying grace regenerative, herein God carryeth himself meerey according to the good pleasure.

pleasure of his own will, according to that of the Apostle, *Hee bath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardneth.* Neither can it bee otherwise; For as much as mercy in regenerating any man, cannot bee shewed according unto good works, and consequently the denying of mercy cannot proceed according to evill works, as I have already demonstrated in the first place.

The Sixth Doubt.

Question, 6.

HOW may it appeare, that the declaration of the equity and sufficiency of Gods justice is reall, and not pretended; since all things are carryed and come to passe, by an absolute and unconditionall decree, and providence: *exempli gratia*, that fact, *Act. 4.28. & 2.23.*

Answer. To say that God carryeth all things by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence, *viz.* opposing absolute to all conditions presupposed in the creature, in my judgment is neither agreeing to the Doctrine of Scripture, nor of our Divines; who doe both teach that as God in the fulnesse of time doth administer and dispense the way of his providence, so hee decreed to dispense them in the same manner from eternity. Now in dispensing the performance of the Covenant of works, the Lord punisheth and rewardeth the creature according to the condition of obedience or disobedience performed by it, as it is at large described, *Levit. 26. Deut. 28.* and therefore surely he decreed to carry such works of his providence upon the same conditions.

The places that may bee alledged to the contrary, do speak of Gods Decree in delivering Christ to death for us, which as it was a work of mere grace, you may safely conceive it was decreed by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence, as generally the works of free grace are. For either they depend on no condition in the creature, or at least on none but such as God is pleased to work in us, and for us. And yet I beleeve that in your own judgement you think not that

God did decree the death of Christ, much lesse deliver him to death, but upon condition of *Adams* fall. If you say, God did as well decree a sinfull manner of the death of Christ by the hands of the wicked, as the death it self, and that by an absolute, an unconditionall decree.

I answer, if you mean an unconditionall decree, presupposing no condition in those creatures, which were the wicked instruments of his death, it is spoken without warrant either from those places, or from any other. That God gave up *Judas* to betray him, it was the punishment of his covetousnesse and hypocrisie. That God gave up the high Priests and Pharisees to conspire against him, to deliver him to *Pilate*, it was the punishment of their ambition and envy, and in some of them their sin against the Holy Ghost. That *Pilate* against his conscience gave judgement against him, it was the judgement of his carnall popularity and his worldly feare of *Cesar*. That the common people and Souldiers cryed out against him, and laid violent hands on him, it was the punishment of their ignorance and infidelity. Now it is out of all controverſie that God doth not punish sin with sin, nor decree to punish, but upon condition of sin presupposed. It is true indeed, God worketh all things after the counsell of his will; but that proveth not that God carryeth all things with an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence. For it is the counsell of his will, as to work the salvation of his Elect according to the Covenant of Grace, freely and absolutely: so to dispense rewards and punishments to the men of this world according to the condition of their obedience or disobedience.

There is therefore no place left for such a question, viz. How it may appeare, that the declaration of the equity of Gods Justice was not pretended, but reall, since all things are carryed and come to passe by an absolute and unconditionall decree of providence. For neither are all things (as it is evident) so carryed, and if they were, I had rather such a question should come out of the mouth of an Arminian, then of any godly and judicious Brother.

The Arminians you know upon a seeming faire pretence, are wont to object against our Divines, that God calleth the Reprobates rather *simulacra* then *seria*; in semblance rather then in truth,

truth, if hee hath before determined of them, by an absolute and unconditionall decree. But the same answer your selfe would return to their objection, the same I return to your question, with more probability, (yea, I may truly say) with more safety.

That no will of God is conditionall, we have the concurrent consent both of our, and Popish Divines. For both *Piscator* maintaines it against *Vorstius*, and *Bradwardine* demonstrates it: And this condition which you speake of, can be no lesse then some motive cause: & *Aquinas* hath professed that never any was so made, as to affirm that there was any cause of Predestination, *quoad actum predestinantis*, as touching the act of God predestinating; and that for no other reason then because there can be no cause of the will of God, *quoad actum volentis*, as touching the act of God willing. Whence it followeth manifestly, that in like sort there can bee no cause of reprobation neither *quoad actum reprobantis*, as touching the act of God reprobating: and consequently no condition. As for the contrary allegations out of Scripture, and out of Divines, I shall be content to consider them, whensoever you shall produce them; but I am perswaded you will not bee forwards to trouble your selfe thereabout, after I shall present unto you how incongruous a course you take to the justifying of that which here you affirme. And not incongruous onely, but most dangerous, tending manifestly to the utter overthrow of the Freeness of Gods grace in Predestination; which indeed very frequently you shake in this unhappy discourse of yours. As God in fulnesse of time doth administer and dispence the wayes of his providence, so (you say) bee decreed to dispence them in the same manner from all eternity. Wee grant it willingly; but what of all this? you adde, that in dispencing the performance of the Covenant of workes, the Lord punisheth and rewardeth the creature according to the conditions of obedience or disobedience performed by it, or rather by the persons under it: This also wee willingly grant. But what doe you inferre herehence? onely this; Therefore surely bee decreed to carry such workes of his providence upon the same conditions. Now this conclusion we embrace as readily as your selfe; but this is farre from justifying the decree of God to bee conditionall. Nay, your selfe doe plainly expresse, that the carriage of such

The will of God, unconditionall.

such workes of his providence is upon such conditions: Not that Gods decree is upon such conditions: which is as much as to say in plaine termes, that the execution of his decree proceeds upon condition, not the decree it selfe. Yet I confesse, in the same manner *Arminius* himselfe and his followers discourse; as if they would explicate themselves in this manner of argumentation. *Sinne alwayes goes before damnation; therefore a respect to sinne goes before Gods decree of damnation;* As if wee should argue thus. Faith in men of ripe yeares alwayes goeth before salvation: therefore a respect unto faith alwayes goeth before Gods decree of salvation. Doe you not perceive by this the dangerous issue of your argumentation? yet this is the very thing they aime at: this is the *Helena* they are enamoured with. But I am confident you are farre from this, and would not a little grieve to understand, that the Orthodox faith of some in the very point of predestination, is not a little shaken by such argumentations as these. And the rather, because they have found such an eminent man as your selfe, not onely to swallow them, but in a confidetary manner to propose them as most sound to give satisfaction unto others. Therefore *Aquinas* fairely distinguisheth of the cause or condition of Gods will, either *quoad actum volentis*, as touching the act of God willing, or *quoad res volitas*, as touching the things willed; no cause or condition thereof, *quoad actum volentis*; there may be *quoad res volitas*. As for example, to give instance in predestination, no cause thereof at all, *quoad actum predestinantis*, as touching the act of God predestinating; there may be a cause thereof *quoad res p. addestinatione preparatas*, as touching the things prepared by predestination. As for example: Grace may bee, and is the cause of glory, and Christs merits may be, and are the cause of grace. So of Reprobation no cause thereof at all, *quoad actum reprobantis*, as touching the act of God reprobating, no more then of the will of God, *quoad actum volentis*, as touching the act of God willing: But there is a cause thereof, *quoad res reprobatione preparatas*, as touching the things prepared by Reprobation, as sin is the cause of condemnation. And indeed many confound these, and thereupon professe the will of God in some cases to bee conditional, the issue whereof is no more then this, That some things

things which God will have to come to passe, shall not come to passe but upon condition. Thus *Vossius* understands *voluntas conditionata*, a conditionate will, which hee attributeth unto God, not considering how handsomely he contradicts himself. And Doctor *Jackson* of *Providence*, discoursing of *voluntas antecedens & consequens*, will antecedent and consequent, promiseth that the distinction is to be understood *non quoad actum volentis*, not touching the act of God willing, but *quoad res voluntas*, as touching the things willed; though his discourse hereupon bee nothing suitable. A manifest evidence that hee understood not the distinction any more then *Vossius* did.

You are willing to acknowledge that Gods decree of delivering Christ to death, was absolute, as a work of meere grace. As for the condition of *Adams* fall to bee premised to this decree, sure I am, that is not your Opinion: neither doth it become any to maintaine any decree of God to be both unconditionall and conditionall. And why that sinne more then any other for which Christ satisfied should be imagined to bee premised as a condition of this decree; I see no reason: and if every sin must bee presupposed, why not the sin of crucifying Christ? This sin started *Arminius*; and this is it, and this alone, which he thinks good to except in this case. I doe nothing wonder that his learning and his honesty were so well met both of a very temperate nature. But albeit the fall of *Adam* was not preconceived to this decree of delivering of Christ to death; yet I am not of your Opinion, who thinke hereupon, that the decree of sending Christ into the world, was before the decree of permitting *Adams* fall: concerning which I have discoursed enough, while I examined how well you cleared the first doubt. But when you distinguish of Gods decree to deliver Christ to death, and to deliver him to a sinfull death; you take a course to make mad work amongst Gods decrees. As if God did first intend the generality of a thing, and not till after the foresight of somewhat else intend the specialty thereof. I will not tell you how undecent a course School-men conceive it to bee, to attribute decrees to God of things indefinite; I never found any *Arminian* take such a course. Philosophy hath taught us, *duplicem ordinem naturae*, a double order of nature; as namely, *natura generantis*, & *natura intendens*, in genera-

neration and intention. And albeit, *secundum naturam generantem, communia & generalia*, are *priora specialibus*, in generation, things common and generall are before their speciall: According as a man in generation, *prius vivit vitam plantæ*, first lives the life of a plant, then *vitam animalis*, the life of an Animal. Lastly, *vitam hominis*, the life of a man; yet *quoad naturam intendentem*, as touching the intention the order is quite contrary, & that the more specialls (as more perfect) are first in intention. And whereas *intentio rerum gerendarum*, the intention of things to be done, is for the production of things in existence; and it is well known that generals cannot exist but in specialls, nor specialls exist but in particulars; it is very strange that God should first intend to produce a *Genius*, and after intend the specialty: seeing nothing can be produced but in particular. You may as well say that God did first intend that Christ should die, but whether a natural or violent death that was at first undetermined. Secondly, that God determined hee should die a violent death, but whether by a judiciall proceeding, or extrajudiciall, that as yet was left undetermined. And see whether this might not be extended further also. But let us examine it by your owne rules, the best course to present before your eyes the strangeness of these conceptions. Three things are to be considered as ordered by you one after another. First, Gods absolute decree to deliver Christ to death. Secondly, the foresight of mens corrupt dispositions. Thirdly, Gods decree to deliver Christ to death by the sins of men.

Now mens sinfull dispositions depending partly upon originall sin derived unto all from the sinne of *Adam*; partly upon mens former actuall conversations; as also upon Gods permission of it to continue uncured and uncorrected; it followeth herehence, that the foresight of these sinfull dispositions did presuppose both that God purposed to permit *Adams* fall, as also to bring these men forth into the world in originall sinne, as also to permit their former actuall sins, whereby they arrive to these vicious habits; together with his purpose to deny grace whereby these vicious habits should be corrected.

Before all these decrees, was the decree of delivering Christ to death by certain sins of certain men, according to your Opinion in this place. Whence it followeth, that the delivering
of

of Christ to death by the sins of men, being last in intention, must bee first in execution, to wit, before *Adam* was suffered to fall, or they suffered by an evill conversation to arise to so corrupt dispositions, or God denied them grace to correct such corrupt dispositions. And though Christs suffering death in a speciall manner, to wit, by the sins of men, were to bee first in execution, yet Christs suffering death in generall and in an indefinite manner, was to bee last in execution. And this argumentation of mine throughout depends meerly upon your own rules delivered in clearing the first doubt. But passe wee over these scrupulosities.

The course you take to explicate Gods providence in punishing sin with sin, is nothing congruous to the examples thereof set down in holy Scripture. For whereas *Judas* his betraying of Christ was a fruit of his covetousnesse, you make Gods giving him over to the committing of this sin to bee the punishment of his covetousnesse. Likewise whereas the High Priests and Pharisees conspiracy against Christ was a fruite of their envy; (for *Pilate* knew that for envy they had delivered him) and of their ambition, as appeareth *Joh. 11. 48.* you make Gods giving them over to the committing of this sin, to bee the punishment of their ambition and envy. In like sort that *Pilate* gave judgement against Christ being a fruit of his popularity and worldly feare of *Cesar*, the giving of him over to the committing of this sin, you make to bee the punishment of his popularity and worldly feare of *Cesar*. So the Jews crying out against him being a fruite of their ignorance and infidelity, the giving them over unto this sin, you make it to bee the punishment of their ignorance and infidelity.

Now shew mee any example throughout the book of God in punishing sin with sin, answerable unto this. As if God did punish mens sinfull dispositions by giving them over to bring forth the proper and congruous fruites of those sinfull dispositions, *Rom. 1.* Wee read God gave the Gentiles over into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient, to commit horrible uncleaneesse. But God hereby punished not the unclean disposition, the fruites whereof were brought forth by Gods giving them over into a reprobate minde, but here-

by God punished their Idolatry, 2 *Theff.* 2. 20. Wee read of Gods giving men over to illusions to beleeeve lies, hereby hee did not punish their infidelity, the fruite whereof was, the beleeeving lies, but hereby hee punished their want of love to Gods truth. So when God sent an evill spirit between *Abimelech* and the men of *Sechem*, to set them together by the eares, hee did not hereby punish their mutuall hatred one against another, but rather their joynt conspiracy against the sons of *Jerubbaa*. I doe not deny but it may bee said, as *Austin* saith, that God hath ordained, *Ut omnis inordinatus animus pena sit sibi*, That every inordinate minde should bee a punishment to it self; but in my judgement it is a strange liberty of speech, to say, that God doth punish a man for his covetousnesse, by not restraining it, but suffering it to have his course.

What you mean by giving *Judas* over to betray Christ, I know not. Gods providence operative in evill, is of an obscure nature. You speak of obduration and of giving over unto sin, but wherein it consists you explicate not. Yet by declining these phrases, you forsake the point in question: Which is not at this present, whether God gave *Judas* over to the betraying of Christ, but whether hee decreed hee should betray him, and the Priests conspire against him, and the people preferre *Barabbas* before him, and *Pilate* condemn him. Which because you not directly deny, the Question is transferred to the manner of this decree: as namely, whether it bee absolute or conditionall. You will have it to bee conditionall, to wit, upon the presupposall of *Judas* his covetousnesse. Yet this you doe not in plain terms expresse, as indeed you seldome set down your meaning plainly, giving your self too much liberty in speaking at large, which is no way conducing to the investigation of truth, but a sore impediment rather. Having said that it is without warrant to say, that the sinfull manner of Christs death was decreed by God by an unconditionall decree, presupposing no condition in the creatures, which were the wicked instruments of his death. Whereas hereupon you should shew upon presupposall of what condition in *Judas*, in the Priests, in *Pilate*, God decreed that *Judas* should betray him, the Priests deliver him to *Pilate*, and *Pilate* condemn him: you decline this, and in a new phrase tell us,

us, that it was the punishment of *Judas* his covetousnesse and hypocrisie, that God gave him up to betray Christ; and in like manner you speak of the rest. Leaving to your Reader to expiscate your direct meaning, and to explicate that which you involve. It seems your meaning is, that upon the foresight of *Judas* his covetousnesse and hypocrisie, God decreed hee should betray him.

Now let us discusse this; If God did in this manner decree it, then certainly upon the covetousnesse of *Judas* hee brought this to passe. Now I demand by what course of providence God brought it to passe, that *Judas* betrayed him? you say it was by giving him over to betray him. Now what you mean by this I know not, neither doe you expresse: but I will indeavour to explain it.

First, I presume your meaning is God did not restrain his covetousnesse, for this seems to bee the meaning of this phrase, *Psal.* 81. where it is said, *God gave them over to their own hearts lusts*, and by way of explication it is added, *And let them follow their own inventions*. Now this course of providence was not sufficient to bring it to passe, that *Judas* should betray him. For this is onely to let him doe what hee will in the course of his covetousnesse. Now though *Judas* was left to doe what hee would in the way of satisfying his covetous course, yet it doth not follow hereupon that *Judas* should betray Christ. Therefore *Arminius* to this decree of God, presupposeth not *Judas* his covetousnesse onely, but his will to betray Christ, as much as to say, God foreseeing hee would betray him, decreed hee should betray him. To this construction of Gods decree you come too neere, though you doe not deliver your self thereof so plainly as hee doth, nor so plausibly. But the mischief is, it is now confessed on all hands, that the very act of willing is wrought by God, and consequently was decreed by God. Now upon what condition presupposed did God decree that *Judas* should will the betraying of Christ? was it upon the foresight of his will? If so, then also upon the presupposition of *Judas* his will to doe this, God did work his will to do this; which is flat contradiction, in making *Judas* his will to doe this, to goe before his will to doe this. Besides, what need was there for God to work his will to doe this, when his will to

doe this is already presupposed? *Bellarmino* goes another way to work, and confessing that God decreed that Christ should bee betrayed and crucified, yet denies that hee decreed that any should betray and crucifie him. Christs suffering was decreed and his patience therein, but not their sin in putting him upon suffering. Your interpretation is lesse plain then theirs, but equally with theirs removed from the truth. Punishment of sin alway presupposeth (I confesse) sin; but I deny that the decree of punishing sin presupposeth sin. If this argument were right; then it would follow, that because to reward with everlasting life, presupposeth good works, Gods decree to reward with everlasting life, presupposeth good works; which is as much to say that election presupposeth good works. For election is the decree of bestowing everlasting life by way of reward; yet here you bring it Gods punishing sin with sin, whereof there is no question here, and forbear to speak of Gods decree, whereof alone is the present question. I pray you what rewards doth God dispense unto Reprobates in regard of their obedience? will you deny plain Text of Scripture expressly professing, *That wee must all appeare afore the judgement seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that hee hath done, whether it bee good or evill?* Onely here is the difference, Christ made satisfaction for Gods Elect, and not of Reprobates. And also merited that God should inable his Elect, and not Reprobates to perform obedience acceptable to God, according to the Covenant of Grace, and that Salvation accordingly shall bee bestowed upon them by way of reward.

Yet I confesse Gods equity and justice in dispensing rewards and punishments is no way prejudiced by the absoluteness of his decree. For hee hath absolutely decreed to deale with men according to that, which they have done in their bodies whether it bee good or evill; though the good which is done is meerely of Gods grace, and his rewarding men accordingly, is no impediment to the course of his Covenant of Grace.

Gods calling of Reprobates wee conceive consists in causing the Gospel to bee Preached unto them, which in effect is this, Whosoever beleeves shall bee saved, whosoever beleevys not shall
bee

bee damned; judge you whether there bee not as much truth in Preaching this to Reprobates, as in Preaching it to the very Elect of God.

The Seventh Doubt.

Question, 7.

THat if all bee translated into Christs Dominion, then the Infants of Turks.

First, how then saith the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7. 14.

Secondly, on all children dying before the guilt of actuall sin, hee will shew the riches of his grace, because their damnation cannot stand, with such an equity of his justice as here is mentioned and made shew of.

To this I answer, that when I say, that *all the creatures are translated into the Dominion of Christ*, I meane not into his Kingdome of a grace, but into the dominion of his power; viz. to be disposed of by him, the wicked to the praise of his justice, and both them and other creatures to the service and exercise of his elect. Hence I conceive it to bee that it is said, that Christ hath bought the dominion of such as deny him. Hence by his dying and rising againe he is said to be *the Lord both of the quick and dead*. Hence God is said to have given all things into his hand, with all power both in heaven and earth. Neither am I able to conceive how the whole body of the Creature, I mean all the world beside Reprobates, can be said to waite for the redemption, and restoring into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, unlesse as they lost their liberty— by the first *Adam*, so they had recovered the same again by the redemption of the second *Adam*. If then all the creatures be translated into the dominion of Christ, thinke it not absurd that the Infants of Turks themselves be translated into the same dominion. The place that may be alledged to the contrary, doth prove the Infants of Infidels not to bee translated into the Kingdom of grace, or fellowship of his Church, but what is that to this point touching children that die in their infancy before the guilt of their actuall sin? I would not hastily determine any thing.

Answer.
Col. 1. 3.

Rom. 14. 9.
John 3. 35.
Mat. 28. 18.
Phil. 1. 8, 9, 10,
11.

The extent of Christs Dominion.

thing. *Præstat dubitare de occultis, quàm ligitare de incertis.* It is better to doubt of secret things, then wrangle about things uncertaine. They stand or fall to him, who hath said of the Infants of such parents, as commend them to the blessing of Christ, *Of such is the kingdom of God.* But to my understanding it is most agreeable to the analogy of faith to range little children under the covenant of Parents, it being Gods usuall manner of dealing, to visit the sins of the Fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him, and to shew mercy unto thousands of them that love him, and keep his commandements.

Mark 10. 14.

Exam.

That all creatures are under the dominion of Christ no Christian doubteth, for as God, hee made all things, *Col. 1. John 1.* and as the son of God, he is the heire of all things, *Heb. 1.* When God bringeth in his first begotten Sonne into the world, he saith of him, *Let all the Angels of God worship him,* *Heb. 1. 6. & Joh. 5.* God hath committed all judgement unto his Son, and *Joh. 17. 2.* Thou hast given him power over all flesh. But that hee hath bought this dominion, well it may passe for an Oracle of flesh and blood, but I have not hitherto found it to bee an Oracle of God. Whatsoever is bought, is bought with a price. And so whatsoever Christ hath bought, hee hath bought with a price, *1 Cor. 6. 20. & 7. 23.* And this price wherewith Christ hath bought that which hee hath bought, is his blood, *Rev. 5. 9. 1 Pet. 1. 18.* But blood is no fit price wherewith to buy Dominion. His blood is propitiatory and satisfactory, and so fit onely to buy poore soules, and to save them from condemnation. And accordingly, the life that hee gave for many, was given by the way of rancome, *Math. 20. 24.* So that persons thereby are ransomed, rather then any generall dominion procured. And is it fit to say, that Christ by his blood obtained dominion over the wicked to damn them for their sins? Rather the power which hee obtained was to give eternall life to them, whom his Father had given him, *Joh. 17. 2.* and that in despite of sin.

Again, is it fit to say that Christ by his blood bought dominion over brute and senselesse creatures? Or, that by his blood hee obtained dominion over Angels and Devils? Whom Christ bought, hee bought unto God, *Rev. 5. 9.* And shall wee say

say that by his death hee bought unto God the dominion over Reprobates, whether Men or Angels, and over all other creatures?

Again, whom hee bought, hee bought from the earth, *Rev.* 14. 8. And from men, *ver.* 4. Can this bee verifed of Angels of light, and of angels of darknesse, and of reprobate men, and of all Gods creatures?

Lastly, whom hee bought by his blood, hee redeemed from their vain conversation, *1 Pet.* 1. 18. So hee did not redeem either reprobate men, or reprobate angels: and as for the Elect Angels they stood not in need of any such Redemption, much lesse the brute creatures of God. Yet even of some that were no better then Reprobates, it is said that hee redeemed them, *2 Pet.* 2. 1. And hence *Arminius* inferres that the most wicked are redeemed by Christ, and that in the same sense that Gods Elect are redeemed by Christ. You say hee redeemed, even the Reprobates, but not in the same manner as hee redeemed the Elect, but onely that hee bought the dominion of them. But this seems a forced interpretation: For whom hee hath bought, they are his in speciall manner. But to bee Christs, is peculiar to Gods Elect, *2 Cor.* 3. ult. And hence the Apostle inferreth, *Glorifie God in your bodies*, *1 Cor.* 6. ult. You will say, In what sense doth the Apostle say of wicked men, that the Lord redeemed them?

I answer, it may bee said in the same sense wherein it is said of the gods of *Damascus* that they plagued *Abaz*: not that indeed they plagued him, or had any power to plague him, for *An Idol is nothing*, saith *Paul*, that is, hath no power to doe good or evill, but it was *Abaz* his opinion that they plagued him, and so hee sacrificed unto them.

Again, their former profession was such, that they were the redeemed of the Lord as well as any other. So *Piscator* interpreteth that place in *Peter*, as spoken, not *et ad idcirco*, but *et idcirco*, not as it were so indeed, but in their opinion onely, or in the common opinion of others. The creature likewise shall bee restored by him, *Act.* 3. *For the Heavens must contain him, till the time come that God hath appointed, for the restoring of all things.* But that redemption is not yet, neither hath hee purchased that redemption with his blood.

The condition of Infants.

Wee deny not that all creatures are under the dominion of Christ, but that they should bee translated into his dominion by way of purchase by his blood, that seemes to mee a strange conceit. Yet it sufficeth us that you confesse, that Turks, together with their Infants, are not translated into the kingdome of Grace. By Infants of Turks wee understand none other then such as dye in their Infancy, and I wonder, you should distinguish betwixt them; Why you should reckon the condition of Infants deacing out of the Church, amongst the number of *the secret things of the Lord*, I see no reason. Are they not born children of wrath? And if they continue so from the time of their conception unto their birth, why not as well from the time of their birth, to the time of their death dying in their Infancy? And can wee doubt what is the condition of those who dye children of wrath? doth not God say of the Sodomites, that *they suffer the vengeance of eternall fire*, and were there (think you) no Infants at all amongst them? As for those who are commended to the blessing of Christ, I make no question but that of such is the Kingdom of God. For the Apostle teacheth us, that if but one parent bee a beleever, the children are holy, but if neither are, they are unclean.

But if they die in their uncleanness, unwashed, unsanctified, what shall become of them?

You doe well in mine opinion, to range little children under the covenant of their Parents: that I like well: but I like not so well the reason whereby you inforce it. For the sins of the Father who is under one Covenant may bee visited upon their children unto the third and fourth generation who are under another covenant. For the sins committed in the dayes of *Manasse*, were in the captivity of *Babylon*, visited upon the children in a fourth generation after, and that upon as gracious children as were those that were represented by the basket of good figges, *Jer. 24.* And the Covenant between *Jonathan* and *David*, was only the preservative for keeping gracious *Mephisobeth*, from having visited upon him the sins of his Grandfather: *Saul*, in slaying the *Gibeonites*. Neither yet have wee cause to complain as the heathen doth *Delicta majorum immeritis luet Romane*. For if I mistake not, there is a great deale of difference between punishing the Son for the sin of the Father,

(which

(which hath no place at all in Gods providence, excepting the case of punishing originall sin, if so it hath place in that) and visiting the sin of the Father upon the Son. This being the punishment of the Father rather then of the Son; And God being able to sanctifie any temporall affliction that falleth upon the son for the sin of his Father, either while the Father liveth or after, and to make it fall amongst the number of those things which work together for his good.

The Eighth and last Doubt.

Question 8.

HOW may it appeare, that this makes not three Covenants? The first of works, requiring perfect obedience.

The second of grace, promiling Christ and all his graces, even faith in him.

The third, partly of grace, providing a redemption, and promising sufficient help; partly as requiring both what wee can doe of our selves, and Gods helpe proceeding with us accordingly.

Answer. This frame of Doctrine is so farre from making three Covenants, that the serious meditation of two Covenants was one of the principall reasons that first turned the stream of my thoughts into this covenant. For when I saw that the Covenant of works did in justice reward according to works, as well with life upon condition of obedience, as with death in case of disobedience; I began to conceive, that as the purpose of election was futable to the Covenant of grace; so futable unto a Covenant of works, must bee a purpose of retribution. For how shall God covenant to retribute or recompence with life or death according to works, if hee have no purpose at all of such retribution? How shall the Covenant of works promise life upon condition of obedience, if the purpose of reprobation have absolutely determined death upon all them within that Covenant, without all respect of good or evill, obedience or disobedience in any of them? the grace of redemption offering the death of Christ, and reaching forth some

The Examination must proceed according to this correction.

The Covenant of Works, and of Grace.

fruites thereof unto all, as the promising and offering sufficient help to bring them to the knowledge of God and means of grace: yea, and sometime bestowing on them the participation of some excellent and common graces, doth not make a third covenant, partly of grace, partly of works, but bindeth such so much the more to keep the Covenants of works, by how much the more helps and means God vouchsafeth them to keep it. It is not the helps of grace offered or given, that includeth men within any part of the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given.

Secondly, if God offer grace and give, though never so small, even as a grain of Mustard-seed, and promise to uphold it freely for Christ his sake, and not according to our works, it is a Covenant of Grace. But if hee offer and give never so many gracious helps, and means, and gifts, and uphold them according to the works of the creature; it is still a Covenant of works, as it was to the Angels that fell, and to *Adam*, though hee gave to both of them the whole Image of God, and besides, heaven it self to the one, a Paradise to the other, it is but the same covenant of works which God made with the world of mankinde after the fall, and with *Adam* before the fall: though *Adam* received greater means and helps to keep it, then his posterity had after the fall.

Because still the condition of the Covenant was the same in both, to reward them both according to their works. So is it still but the same Covenant of works which God makes with mankinde, when hee offereth them in Christ, greater grace and helps to keep it, then after the fall they could have attained unto without Christ, because still the condition of the Covenant runneth in the same tenour, to deal with them according to their works.

Neither doe I conceive any danger in the point, though by this means obedience to Christ, and walking worthy of him, should bee commanded in the Law, which is a covenant of works. For if the infidelity and disobedience of the men of this world to the Gospel of Christ bee sin, then are they also transgressors of the Law, and then the contrary vertues are commanded in the Law.

Thirdly, the Ceremonies of the Old Testament, which were figures

figures of Christ, were commanded in the second precept of the Law, was not Christ himself under those figures commanded also? were they commanded to lay their hands on the sacrifices, and not withall to lay their Faith on Christ? were they commanded to look on the Brazen Serpent, and not withall to behold Christ? were they commanded to obey *Moses*, and not withall the Prophet like unto *Moses*? What then? doe wee confound the Law and the Gospel? God forbid; The Law indeed commandeth to obey God in whatsoever hee had of old, or in fulnesse of time, should afterwards reveale to bee his will: but it is one thing to command Christ to bee obeyed and revealed, (which after Christ is revealed, even the Law also doth to all that heare it) another thing it is to give Christ freely, and faith to receive him, and the spirit likewise to obey him, yea and perseverance: also notwithstanding our unworthinesse to continue in him, all which the Gospel promiseth to the Elect of God.

Glory bee to God in Christ, and peace upon Israel.

If the serious consideration of two covenants did turn the stream of your thoughts into this *covenant*, it should seem you doe acknowledge a third covenant, distinct from the former two. Therefore I conceive there is an error in the writing; and that whereunto the stream of your thoughts was turned, is not a different covenant from the former two, but rather an opinion concerning reprobation, different from that which is most generally received amongst our Divines. And albeit hereupon you fell on this; yet herehence it followeth not, but that you might hereby fall upon laying a ground for three covenants ere you are aware. Yet do I not charge you with this. As in some respect you may seem to make three; so in another respect you may seem to make but one; if the covenant of retribution according unto works bee but one; For I see no reason but Gods purpose of election, may well passe for a purpose of retribution; and consequently, if the purpose of election and reprobation bee reduced unto one, why may not the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, by your rules bee reduced into one? As election is Gods purpose to bestow everlasting life, seeing God doth not purpose to bestow it, but by way of

Exam.

* Indeed it should bee not Covenant, as my Copy had it, but current, as a friend shewed mee how to correct it.

The difference between the Covenant

reward of obedience, of faith and repentance, and good works; it necessarily followeth that Gods election is his purpose of retribution. But there is besides in election, a purpose to work a certain number of men unto faith, obedience, and good works, and unto a finall perseverance in them all. So likewise between the covenant of the Law and the covenant of Grace, there is this principall difference: that God inables his elect to the performance of the one, not of the other; but as touching the reprobate, hee inableth them to the performance of neither condition. Subservient to Gods election of some is each covenant. The covenant of works to humble them, not onely upon the consideration of their sins, whereby they have merited eternall death; but especially upon consideration how their naturall corruption is so farre from being mastered and corrected by the Law, as that on the contrary it is irritated and exasperated so much the more. Then the covenant of grace to comfort them, considering how the condition of life is aduclced and tempered, being from exact and strict obedience changed into faith and repentance; but chiefly upon consideration that the word of this covenant is a word of power: mastering their corruption, and inabling to perform faith, repentance, and Evangellicall obedience in an acceptable manner unto the Lord. Subservient to the purpose of reprobation may bee the Law, only written in mens hearts, which very obscurely, intimateth (if at all) any covenant made of everlasting life between God and man. Where the word is revealed, that in generall comprehending both Law and Gospel, is subservient thereunto in the way of instruction and exhortation, and the like, thereby taking away all excuse.

Of any other end intended towards them I know not, except sometimes, as *Austin* observeth, *Ut proficiant ad exteriorem vite emendationem quo mitius puniantur*. And why I pray may not the covenant of workes promise life upon condition of obedience, notwithstanding the purpose of reprobation hath absolutely determined death, upon all them within the Covenant: as well as the Covenant of grace threatens death upon condition of disobedience of faith and repentance: notwithstanding that the purpose of election hath absolutely determined life upon all them within that Covenant. And yet like

as in election wee acknowledge a respect to obedience, consequent thereunto, in as much as it includes a purpose to give grace to work them to obedience, though not any respect thereto, as antecedent to the decree it self; how much more may you easily conceive, that in reprobation wee deny not a respect to disobedience consequent, for as much as it includes a purpose to deny grace, which alone can prevent disobedience, though not any respect to disobedience as antecedent to the decree of reprobation? And to reapeate by the way, that which formerly hath been delivered.

Respect to disobedience as antecedent to the decree of damnation cannot bee imagined, unlesse withall you imagine God did first decree to permit it, and thereupon for the foresight thereof decree to damne for it: Whence it followeth that permission of disobedience must bee first in intention, in comparison with condemnation, and consequently it must bee last in execution by your own rules, formerly laid down as unquestionable foundations. Yet doe not I maintain that God in any moment of nature, doth first decree damnation, and then decree the permission of sin, for which hee damnes them; I make these decrees not subordinate as most doe, but co-ordinate and joynt decrees, being onely concerning meanes tending to the same end. And with *Aquinas*, I say that reprobation includes *Voluntatem permittendi culpam*, & *condemnationem inferendi pro culpa*. The end whereof is the demonstration of his glory in the way of justice. But withall I desire that *culpa* in this description of reprobation may bee understood aright, and not as *Arminius* doth, whose superficial consideration of things is usually for his advantage, making him thereby the more to abound in arguments for the impugning of his adversaries opinions, according to his own shaping of them quite beside their meaning. For *culpa* is not sin in generall in this definition, but onely such a sin, *propter quod quis damnatur*, for which a man is damned; that is, finall perseverance in infidelity or impenitency. When you say the grace of redemption offers the death of Christ, and reacheth forth some fruit thereof unto all, you walk according to your course in the clouds of your own mysteries.

What you mean by these fruites you speak of, and by the reach-

reaching of them forth, I am utterly to seek; neither doth ought you have formerly delivered helpe mee in this. But in these particulars it seems you love to speak darkly; and keep your self to generall terms. I know no condition proposed in the Gospel, for receiving of any benefit from Christ, but faith and repentance. But you seem to bring in gracious helps for the obtaining of faith and repentance, to bee tendred unto us for Christs sake upon other conditions, I know not what; neither have I hitherto received any ground of assurance from this your discourse, that your self know what. In the next place you seem to specifie what these fruites are, as when you say, that it promiseth and offereth sufficient helpe to bring them to the knowledge of God, and means of grace, still keeping your self in the generall, as if you feared to bee understood. And I wonder not a little that your self being a man of such reputation, and much exercised in giving satisfaction, addressing your self to give satisfacti^{on} in so tender and precious points of Divinity as these, should deliver your self in so strange a language. But let us take the more paines in discussing the clouds of your Phrasologies. When you say the grace of redemption promiseth and offereth sufficient helps; your meaning must bee that the Gospel of Christ doth promise and offer this, for as much as wee are acquainted with no promises of Grace but in the Gospel. Yet this phrase of expressing, used by you, is enough to trouble a Reader, who when the matter wee treat of is difficult enough, might justly desire that hee might not bee put to other trouble, as to interpret mens expressions. Yet it may bee you may think to have a ground for this out of Saint Paul, where hee saith, *The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all, teaching us to deny ungodliness*; and by which grace hee seemes to meane the Gospel. Bee it so, yet Saint Paul doth not call it the grace of redemption, as you doe. Redemption in Scripture phrase signifies forgiveness of sins, *Ephes. 1. 7. and Col. 1. 14.* If this bee your meaning, I finde no congruity in this your affirmation. For what? will you say the Gospel preached, doth promise and offer to bring men to the knowledge of God, and means of grace? I had thought rather it had brought the knowledge of God and meanes of grace to them. Or rather is the very
bring-

bringing of it, or to speak more properly is the very means of grace it self. All which considered, I am yet to seek of your meaning, I finde it so miserably involved, and that in the very close of all, enough to make any intelligent Reader despaire to receive satisfaction from you, when in the very last act hee shall finde himselfe so farre from making any tolerable construction of your words, thereby to pick out any sober meaning.

Then againe, by offering helps, you seem to imply some termes or condition whereupon it is offered them, but no such condition is expressed by you. If it had, perhaps thereby wee might have taken the altitude. I mean the depth of your meaning throughout. The same grace of redemption bestows also (you say) sometimes some excellent though common graces. I have heard (I confesse) you stand much upon common graces. But what they are, and to what end they tend, and whether absolutely or conditionally imparted according to your opinion: when I shall bee sufficiently informed, I will doe my best indeavour to weigh them in the ballance of Christian and Scholasticall examination, and accordingly to give them that due respect which belongs unto them. It may bee about a third covenant, which they might seem to make, partly of grace and partly of works: I should not bee much contentious. Yet it followeth not, that because they doe binde the more to the keeping of the Covenant of works, as having more means and helps vouchsafed unto them; therefore it doth not make a third Covenant: You say it is not the helps of grace offered or given, that include men within any part of the covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given: that is, whereupon they are offered or given, to wit, the helps of grace.

Here new mysteries offer themselves againe, I must bee driven *Balaam*-like to cast about for divinations: and whether in the issue I shall finde that I seek for, I cannot assure my self. You came but now from speaking of common graces, and by the coherence, these helps of grace which here you speak of, should bee those common graces, considered as helps of grace speciall. Now had you given instance, and shewed what these common graces are, they might of themselves have discovered

the reference wherein they stand unto grace speciall, which I ghesse to bee faith and repentance. This you might easily have done, and saved us a great deale of irresolution and paines also, partly in seeking after that which wee cannot easily finde, and partly in labouring to disprove wee know not what. This confused course proceeds in some from an ill minde, fearing lest their opposites should have too much liberty by their plaine dealing to impugnethem, but in good men it proceeds from the weaknesse of their cause, and from the uncertainty and ambiguity of their thoughts, for the justifying of that which they doe maintain. But let us proceed. These helps of grace by which I hope you mean, helps unto faith and repentance, you plainly signifie are offered upon a condition, and by the quality of this condition wee may judge whether they to whom they are offered are included within the covenant of grace or no.

Now let us indeavour to found your meaning; These helps of grace must needs bee, either outward means, or inward qualities and habits.

By helps I should understand outward means, after mine own phrased of speech, and by yours also I have good cause; for as much as in the words immediately going before, you joyn helps and means together, and confound common graces with them both. As for means of grace, they are not given upon condition; for what condition can bee imagined whereupon the Gospel should bee given to a Nation? shall it bee the using of their naturalls right? how will you bee able to make it good, that heathen men before they injoyed the Gospel, did use their naturalls right? Did the *Corinthians* who were carryed away with dumb Idols even as they were led? *1 Cor. 12. 2.* And for not honouring God as God, did not God give them up into a reprobate minde, to doe things inconvenient as well as others, thereby to receive the recompence of their errors? Judge of this by that which the Apostle mindes them of, *1 Cor. 6.* For after hee had told them that neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Wretches, nor Buggers, nor Theeves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Raylers, nor Extortioners, shall inherit the Kingdom of God, *ver. 9. 10.* forthwith hee addeth *οὐκ ἔσονται οὗτοι*, these

these things were some of you, as much as to say, some of you were fornicators, some adulterers, some Idolaters, some wantons, some buggers, some thieves, some covetous, some drunkards, some taylers, some extortioners; or some of them in diverse kindes, if not in all these kindes lyable to condemnation, and utter exclusion out of the Kingdom of God: *But* (yet for all this) *ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God,* ver. 11. And is it not manifest that when the Gospel is first preached to any Nation, it is preached as well to the uncivill as to those that are civill: as well to the debauched as to the morall?

Again, In this case, the Gospel should bee bestowed by way of reward of obedience: but obedience is no obedience, unlesse it bee performed upon knowledge, in obedience unto some Law given. Now how could the Gentiles know of any such Law, that whosoever used their naturalls should bee rewarded with the benefit of the Gospel; seeing this is no where pretended to bee revealed but in the Gospel? So that as soon as any man hears of such a Law, hee already enjoyeth the Gospel. These two first of these arguments may as well bee applied against this doctrine of yours, if by helps of Grace you mean some habits or qualities besides that which may bee further alledged upon your specification, what these habits and qualities are.

And here is a faire way opened for a third Covenant; for as for the two covenants commonly acknowledged, they are one-ly for the obtaining of Salvation different wayes: besides which here is brought in another Covenant for the obtaining the means of grace, and that different wayes also, to wit, either by works or by Grace. But when I look unto your former words and consider them well, as when you say it is not the helps of grace offered or given; that include men within any part of the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon it is offered or given, these words, It is offered or given, perhaps are not referred to the helps of grace, but rather to the grace it self, yet I interpret them of the helps of grace, with no other mind then to save this rule of yours from manifest contradiction.

How they within the Covenant of grace,

For by your rule you professe, that the inclusion of some within the covenant of grace, and the exclusion of others, depends not upon any indifference in the things offered or given, but onely on the condition whereupon they are offered or given; manifestly implying thereby, that the same things are given to them that are without the covenant, and to them that are within; but the difference is onely in the condition whereupon they are given.

But if your rule run thus, it is not the helps offered or given, that include a man within the Covenant of grace, but the condition whereupon the grace it self is given. Hereby you manifest that they within the Covenant of grace, and they without are distinguished, not onely by the condition, whereupon that which they have is given, but also by the things themselves which are given them: for as much as onely the helps of grace are given to the one, to wit, to them that are without the covenant, but not only helps of grace, but grace it self is given to the other, which serves directly contrary to your rule here given: not to speak of the miserable confusion that like a Leprosie seizeth upon your manner of expression, and which you hold up in the beginning of your next session. But before I come to the scanning thereof, let mee tell you of your dis-junctive phrase, as when you said, *offered or given*; this is very ill-accommodated to the helps of grace, if you meane helps outward, such as the Gospel; for the Gospel where it is preached, there it is not onely offered, but *bee ipso* given.

The phrase *offered*, is as ill accommodated to grace it self in respect of the condition, whereupon depends admission into the covenant of grace. For to offer to a man admission into the covenant of grace upon condition, is to offer it upon a condition to bee performed by him to whom it is offered. But such an offering your self confesse doth savour of a covenant of works, but when the condition is meerly for Christs sake, that you say makes the covenant of grace. Now to that which followeth.

If God offer (say you) and give it, to wit, [grace] though never so small, even as a grain of mustard seed, and promiseth to uphold it freely for Christs sake, and not according to our
works,

works, it is a covenant of grace. But if hee offer and give never so many helps, and means, and gifts, and uphold them according to the works of the creature, it is still a covenant of works, as it was to the Angels that fell, and to *Adam*. Here you continue your former confusion; for pretending to maintain the difference between them within, and them without the covenant of grace, as depending meerely upon the condition, whereupon things are given; you notwithstanding this, make a difference also in the things given. For the one thing, given to them within the covenant of grace, you seem to make grace it self, though perhaps as small as a grain of mustard seed, and not onely helps of grace; but the things given to them without the Covenant, are onely gracious helps and means. And withall you deale not fairely in the expression of that which you intend; for you do not make it plainly appeare, that you put a difference between the things given (lest you should contradict your self, for you place the difference onely in the condition whereupon the thing given, is given) but that which is given to them within the covenant of grace you formerly expressed by the relative [*it*], which made mee in doubt whether I should referre it to grace it self; or to the helps of grace; yet forthwith on the other side running again to helps, you doe not style them helps of grace, as before you did, which doth manifestly distinguish helps of grace, from grace it self, but you call them gracious helps and means, and not contented with that, you adde *gifts* also, as if your purpose were not to distinguish them from grace in the other member of the comparison mentioned, but rather to confound them therewith. Which I confesse sorts best with your rule, which placeth the difference only in the condition of the things given, and not in the things given themselves. And this is further confirmed by the instance given in Angels and *Adam*, where you plainly give us to understand, that by gracious helps and means, and gifts given them, you understand the Image of God; which clearly signifies not any outward help and means, (after which manner I was prone to interpret this phrase of yours) but the very inward sanctification of their natures, which in my judgement is very untowardly called means of grace, or helps of grace.

270 *Whether power to beleeve and repent is given*

Whereas it is rather, that holy power wherewith God had indued them to perform that which hee had commanded them. For of *Adam*, that is undoubtedly true which *Austin* saith, namely, that God gave *Adam*, *posse si voluit; non dedit velle quod potuit*, power to obey if hee would, but not a will to doe that which hee could; and questionlesse it is as true of the Angels as of *Adam*.

And this power I confesse had continued in them, had they performed actuall obedience according to that power, whereof by their disobedience they were deprived. Whereby you give mee good ground to guesse, what that opinion of yours is, (which you carry wondrous closely, (and I verily beleeve because of the offensive nature thereof to good men, such as your self) namely, That power to beleeve and repent is given to them as well without the covenant, as to them within; like as both Angels and *Adam* before their fall, had power to perform obedience to Gods Commands: But to them within the covenant of grace, it is given and upheld onely for Christs sake; to others it is to bee given and upheld onely according to the covenant of works, that is, upon condition of some performance of theirs. But yet of the full pourtraiture of your opinion, I am to seek in some particulars: As

First, what the condition is upon the performance whereof they shall have power given them to beleeve and repent. Whatsoever you say, or give instance in, if it bee a work of nature, it will necessarily follow that grace shall bee possibly, at least resolved into a work of nature; then wee are where wee are, and still to seek how they came by power to perform that work of grace.

Secondly, I am to seek by what means God doth work this power, whether onely by perswasion, which is onely a morall action, or by an immediate change of their natures by the inspiration of Gods Spirit.

Now the first of these cannot bee; for perswasion hath no power to change the nature of ought, and work new powers in it, which are not wrought without giving a new life. And indeed perswasion tends rather to move men to doe that which they have power to doe, then from thence to receive a power of doing. Wee doe not perswade men, *ut possint aliquid facere,*
sed

sed ut velim, but faciam, to bee able to do ought, but to move them to bee willing to doe it.

If by immediate inspiration giving a new life, then it follows that regeneration is a common grace, possible at least, given to them as well without the Covenant of grace, as to them within: to the Reprobates as well as to the Elect, and that upon performance of a work of nature. And because it were in vain to speak of upholding it after it is given, unlesse it were given indeed, you imply hereby that even this power is given to Reprobates. But whereas it is to bee upholden but upon condition, yet you doe not expresse what this condition is. But I guesse the condition hereof is the exercising of this power; like as upon the exercising of the power which God gave Angels and *Adam*, before the fall, they had been confirmed in their integrity. But what if they do not beleue or repent for a year or two together; yet I presume you will not say they are thereupon deprived of this power, but that it continueth for ought wee know to the contrary to their lives end; though it fell out quite contrarily with Angels and *Adam*, who immediately upon their disobedience were deprived of this power. What is your meaning when you say, God offers mankinde in Christ, greater grace and helps to keep the Covenant of works, then after the fall they could have attained to without Christ. I cannot easily comprehend, and throughout finde you very close and reserved hereupon, which to speak like a free man, is no good dealing.

First, I know not what that grace and help is, which here you speak of. If your meaning bee no more but this, that they have more power to perform the Covenant of works through Christ, then otherwise; (as I guesse it will come to no more in the end) I pray you what think you of mankinde before Christ came into the world, had they this power you speak of through Christ? If you think they had, I pray you how came they by it? If onely it hold of mankinde since the preaching of the Gospel; I demand whether of all, or some; if of all, then you must acknowledge the Gospel to bee preached to all. If onely of them to whom it is preached; yet the question still is, whether it bee wrought by perswasion or inspiration.

Secondly, in saying that in Christ they have greater grace

to.

How grace offered in Christ.

Rom. 8.

to help to keep it, your phrase doth imply, that even without Christ men have grace and helps and power to keep the Covenant of works. In a word, dare you say that any naturall man hath any power to bee subject to the Law of God, or to doe that which is pleasing in Gods sight? If you say they have any such power, I demand whether ever any were found subject to the Law of God, or did that which was pleasing in Gods sight? It is very strange that never any such act should proceed from a power so generall. If they were, or did that which was pleasing in Gods sight; then they were not in the flesh, for *they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*

Lastly, when you say, these helps or this power is offered them in Christ; it implies that upon some condition performable on their parts it is offered unto them. Now it were very requisite you should deale plainly; and expresse this condition, which you doe not. I confesse I see no danger in acknowledging that God purposeth to deale with mankind according to their works; nay I wonder you should exclude the elect from the number of those with whom God deales in this manner, when the Apostle professeth so directly, wee must all appear before the judgement seat of God, that every man may receive the things which are done in his body, according to that hee hath done, whether good or evill, *2 Cor. 5. 10.* Only for Christs sake God giveth faith and repentance to some, working in them that which is pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ; and doth not deale in the like mercy with others.

The rest of this Section I dislike not.

Glory bee to God in Christ, and peace upon Israel,

In submission unto his Truth.

For why should wee lye for God, as man doth for man, to gratifie him?

FOR



For an Auctarium, here is laid down a
 short Survey of the ninth Chapter to the
Romans, so farre as it treateth of the Do-
 ctrine of Predestination: the better to clear
 some passages of the former Discourse.

THe whole Chapter from the first verse to the 23. is taken *Analysis.*
 up in the answering of objections, each latter arising from
 the answer to the former: for the Apostle having taught in the
 last verse of the former Chapter, that nothing can separate
 us from the love of God in Christ giveth occasion of this doubt
 that may arise.

Quest. What think you of the Jews, are not they the Elect
 people of God, and yet are not they separate from Christ?

Ans. The Apostle doth not plainly affirm it, that they are
 separate from Christ, but with much compassion bewailes it,
 yea, and protesteth, that hee would wish himself rather sepa-
 rate from Christ for their sakes: The grounds of which hee
 rendreth to bee for his kindreds sake, *ver. 3.* for their priviledges
 sake, *ver. 4. 5.*

This coherence I could brook well enough, onely I say it is *Exam.*
 devised at pleasure: and I finde it is a generall course to feign
 coherences, and sometimes onely to shape thereby some con-
 firmation of the Apostles meaning to their interpretation of
 him. The Apostle I am sure makes none, and accordingly Lu-
 dovici Leoburgensis professeth, saying, *Prorsus nova disputatio*
instituitur, in qua tametsi doctrinam de Justificatione alicubi repetit
& intertextit, tamen duas alias materias principales tractat: videli-
cet, quis sit vere populus Dei, seu que sit vera Ecclesia, & de voca-
tione Gentium. Judæi contendebant, se esse Ecclesiam, se esse populum;
ad se solos pertinere promissiones. Paulus respondet Electos esse popu-
los Dei. The disputation here instituted by the Apostle, is alto-
 gether new, wherein although hee doth sometimes repeale and
 insert the Doctrine of Justification; yet hee handles two other

Isaac and Iacob children of promise.

principall matters, to wit, who are the people of God in truth, and which is the true Church; and of the calling of the Gentiles. The Jews contended that they were the Church, they were Gods people, and that to them alone pertained the promises. *Paul* answers that the Elect alone are Gods people.

Analysis. What is then the word (the word of promise of inseparable conjunction with Christ) to them of none effect?

Ans. No, all are not *Israel* which are of *Israel*: nor are all the children of *Abraham*, that are of the seed of *Abraham*, but in *Isaac* are his seed called, viz. Not the children of *Abraham*s flesh are the children of God, but the children of promise, ver. 6, 7, 8. which hee proveth by a twofold instance, or example.

First, of *Isaac* the seed of *Abraham* by *Sarah*, who was given unto him as his seed by the word of promise, ver. 9.

Secondly, of *Jacob* the seed of *Isaac* by *Rebekah*, of whom another promise was given, that the elder brother should bee to him a servant, ver. 11.

Which promise touching *Jacob* is amplified by,

First, the freeness of it, all cause of different acceptance being removed from the two brethren, and in regard, first, of parentage, ver. 10. secondly, of personall condition and indowments, ver. 11, which freeness is also further set forth by the end of it, that the purpose of God might stand firm, as not depending on any condition in the Creature, ver. 11.

Secondly, A parallell promise spiting to it, preferring *Jacob* before *Esau* in Gods affection, when they were both considered onely as brethren, ver. 12.

Enam.

These words of the Apostle are I confesse the key of the whole Chapter, for opening the meaning, or at least making way to a faire understanding of all that follows. If the Jews are reject-

ed

ed as the Apostle presupposeth (to wit, as touching the most of them) in the former words, then it may seem that Gods word is of none effect, which consequence, (the Apostle supposing such a consequence likely to bee made) by his denying of it doth imply, that there was some Word of God that seemed to bee made of none effect by this Doctrine concerning the rejection of the Jews. This word therefore is to bee inquired into, the investigation whereof will give light to all the rest. Now this word can bee no other then the word of some promise made by God for the taking of the seed of *Abraham* to bee his people, to bee his Church. For such a promise alone seems to stand in contradiction unto our Christian Doctrine, concerning the rejection of the Jews. And indeed such a promise God made to *Abraham*, *Gen. 17. 7. I will establish my Covenant between mee and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting Covenant, To bee a God to thee and to thy seed after thee.* This I conceive to bee the Word of God, which the Apostle had before his eyes when hee delivered this, and denied that this word and promise of God can bee of none effect; although it bee granted, that most part of the Jews bee rejected, provided that all are not. And hee gives this reason, to wit, because this word and promise of God concerning *Abrahams* seed to bee taken into his Covenant of Grace, did not comprehend all his seed: for all are not *Israel*, that are of *Israel*, &c. seeing then wee doe not maintain that all *Israel* are rejected (for as it followeth, *Rom. 11. 1. I demand then; Hath God cast away his people? God forbid, For I am also an Israelite. God hath not cast away his people whom hee knew before, ver. 5. Even so then at this present there is a remnant according to the Election of grace.* Withall the Apostle signifyeth that not one of Gods people is rejected: to wit, not one of them whom hee did foreknow, which *Rom. 9. 8.* are called children of promise, in opposition to the children of the flesh: alluding to *Isaac*, who was begotten beyond the power of nature, and by vertue of Gods promise made to *Abraham* for a Son, when both hee and *Sarah* were dead as touching any naturall power to beget, or conceive a Childe. But God to make his promise good, inabled them with power hereunto above nature. And conformably hereunto alluding also to the condition of Gods children begotten unto

him, not by power of nature, but above nature, by vertue of a promise likewise, even that which hee made unto *Abraham*, that in his seed (that is, in Christ) all the Nations of the earth should bee blessed. That is, the Elect of God amongst all Nations. And to make this good by the power of his grace and his holy Spirit, hee begets them unto himself, each in his appointed time according to their generations.

Quest. Is there not then unrighteousnesse with God to deale so unequally with persons equall? *ver. 14.*

Ans. God forbid, which denyall the Apostle proveth by a double testimony of *Moses*, both of them declaring the absolute Sovereignty of God over the creatures, and thereby his liberty to deale diversly or unequally with persons equall.

First, the one by shewing the independency of his mercy, *ver. 15.* wherein hee inferreth a Corollary denying the obtaining of mercy to the means which the creature useth who findeth mercy, *ver. 16.*

Secondly, by declaring and setting forth the right God challengeth to himself, to stirre up a sinfull Creature to this purpose, to shew his power on him, though it bee in his just hardning and overthrow, *ver. 17.* Where hee inferreth another Corollary arising from both these places, ascribing as well the hardning of the creature that is hardned, as the shewing mercy to him that obtaineth mercy, both to the absolute Sovereignty of Gods will, *ver. 18.*

Exam.

This objection ariseth from the consideration of the equality of *Esaú* and *Jacob*, before they were born, and whilest they were in their mothers wombe.

The Answer is rightly conceived, as freeing God from injustice, by reason of the sovereignty hee hath over his creatures and liberty thereupon to deale, not onely as here it is expressed in generall, diversly, or unequally with persons equall (for so hee deales even with his Elect) giving a greater measure of grace to one, as even to *Saul* a persecutor and lesse to another though never so morall, and free from such as the world accounts, foule sinnes before their callings, but so unequally as to shew mercy unto one, and to deny mercy unto the other. For the more full explication whereof wee are to consider, that righteousness or Justice is taken in a double notion. The one is, when

when things are carried towards men according to their works: The other is, when a man doth no other thing then hee hath power to doe; as in executing the power that God hath given them over inferiour Creatures, wee are just though wee doe kill Sheep, or Oxen, &c. Not in reference to any works of theirs, but onely in reference to our own necessary use, and unto that lawfull power which God hath given us to serve our own turns of them. And thus God is not unjust or unrighteous, but righteous and just, in shewing mercy on some, and not on others, when there is no difference between them.

But whereas it is said, *ver. 16.* that the Apostle inferreth a Corollary, denying the obtaining of mercy to the means, which the Creature useth to finde mercy; implying that when the Apostle saith, it is not of him that willeth, and of him that runneth, this of willing and running are the meanes to obtaine mercy.

I no way like this, for if it bee understood of willing and running in a naturall manner, such willing and running are no means to obtain mercy: Or if it bee to bee understood of willing and running in a gracious manner; whosoever thus willeth and runneth hath obtained mercy: as the Apostle signifyeth when hee saith, *I found mercy that I should bee faithfull.* And to obtain mercy in the Apostles phrase, *Rom. 11. 30.* and *31.* is clearely to obtain faith and repentance; So that according to this exposition, the meaning of the Apostle is this; though man is hee who beleeveeth and repenteth, yet the glory of all is to bee given unto God, as who sheweth mercy to whom hee will, when as freely hee denyeth it to others, and so hardneth them. And that this is the Apostles meaning in this place, it appeareth by the Antithesis which the Apostle makes, between shewing mercy on the one side, and hardning on the other.

Again, whereas the right of God in stirring up a creature to this purpose to shew his power on him, though it bee in his hardning, and overthrow; this right I say, or rather the exercise of this right in God, is confined to a sinfull creature, this is quite besides the Apostles Text; For albeit the creatures hee speaketh of (as *Pharaoh* and the rebellious *Israelites*) were sinfull creatures, yet it doth not follow that the Apostle in the

The irresistibility of Gods will,

Doctrine which here hee delivereth, taketh any notice of their sinfulness; As indeed it is apparent that hee doth not justifie Gods courses here mentioned upon the consideration of their sinfulness, but only upon the consideration of Gods Sovereignty over his creatures. And indeed it is plain, that of two sinners God can give the grace of raising from sin to whom hee will, and deny it unto the other: so it is manifest that of two creatures standing in the estate of grace, God can maintain the one in that estate by his corroborating grace, and by denying the same grace, permit the other to fall from that estate of innocency wherein hee stood; As it is clear in the difference that God put betwixt the Angels that stood, to wit, his elect Angels, and those that fell; they that stood being *amplius adiuti*, more succoured then the other, as *Austin* professeth, *De Civ. Dei, lib. 12. cap. 9.* And *Coqueus* at large upon him. So that in this respect the denying of corroborating grace to those Angels that fell, while before they were without sin, was just with God; not in any reference unto their works, as if they had deserved that God should permit them to fall into sin, it being impossible that any creature should deserve this. For in this case there should bee acknowledged a sin to precede the first sin, which cannot bee avouched, without manifest contradiction. But it is just in respect of Gods Sovereignty to keep from sin whom hee will, and to permit whom hee will to fall into sin.

Quest. Thou wilt further say unto me, Why doth hee yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?

Ans. To this the Apostle returneth answer in foure materiall points.

First, Hee checketh the petulancy of the creature, by shewing that though God should harden the creature by his irresistible will, yet it is not for the creature to reply thus to God; this hee doth by a comparison, arguing Gods Sovereignty over the creature, suitable to the power which the potter hath over the clay, *ver. 20.*

Secondly, hee admitteth a denyall or at least a mitigation of the rigour of that word objected in the manner of Gods hardning by his irresistible will, instead whereof the Apostle implyeth, hee doth rather harden by his suffering and long patience. What if God suffer in long patience, &c. *ver. 22.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Hee cleareth the justice of God in hardning the creature, by shewing the conditions of those persons, whom hee thus hardneth, not creatures that have done neither good nor evill; but, 1. vessels of wrath; which men are not, till first considered as sinners: 2. fitted, or as it were perfected and ripened unto destruction, which *Ephes. 2. 23.* men are not till after the refusall of the means of grace, *Ephes. 2. 4.* *2 Chron. 36. 19, 16.* or else after grosse and unnaturall iniquity, *Gen. 15. 16.* compared with *Levit. 28. 27, 28, 29.*

Fourthly, hee declares the holy ends which God aims at in all this his dealing with vessels of wrath after this manner; which ends are the manifestation, first, of his power and wrath toward the wicked, *ver. 22.* secondly, of the riches of his glorious grace toward the elect, in dealing far otherwise with them, *v. 23.* *Rom. 11. 33.* *Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom, and of the power of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his wayes past finding out! To him be glory forever, Amen.*

By this objection arising out of the former Doctrine, name- *Exam.*
ly, that God hath mercy on whom hee will, and hardneth others: hee doth evince that by shewing mercy, is signified Gods giving the grace of obedience; by hardning, his denying the same grace of obedience; And withall that by denying this grace it comes to passe, that men cannot obey the will of God, seeing hereby is manifested, that Gods will is not, they should obey, but rather continue in their hardnesse of heart uncured, and consequently in their disobedience, whereupon it seems unreasonable that God should complain of mens disobedience, as oftentimes hee doth, as *Esa. 1.* *Hear, O Heavens, and hearken O Earth, I have nourished and brought up a people; and they have rebelled against mee.* Again, *Esa. 65.* *All the day long have I stretched out my hands unto a people that walk in a way that is not good, even after their own imaginations,* And *Jer. 8. 7.* *Even the Stork in the aire, knoweth her appointed times, and the Turtle, and the Crane, and the Swallow observeth the time of their coming, but my people knoweth not the judgements of the Lord, and ver. 6.* *I hearkned and heard, but none spake aright, no man repented of his wickednesse, saying, what have I done? Every one turneth into their race, as the horse rusheth into the battle.* And *Hose. 7. 14.* *Though I have bound and strengthened their arm, yet they have rebelled against mee.* And *Exod. 10. 2.*

Thus

280 Gods absolute Sovereignty over the Creatures.

Thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, *How long wilt thou refuse o humble thy self before mee? Let my people goe that they may serve mee, ver. 4. But if thou refuse to let my people goe, behold, to morrow I will bring Grasshoppers into thine house, &c. ver. 20. But the Lord hardened Pharaohs heart, and hee did not let the children of Israel goe.* Now this I say seems most unreasonable in the judgement of flesh and blood. Namely, both to harden a mans heart, and yet to complain of, and finde fault with the hardnesse of his heart, with his rebellion and disobedience, considering that no man can resist his will.

To this the Apostle answereth in certain notable particulars.

First, shewing that when the Scripture doth manifest this to bee Gods course, namely to harden, and yet to complain of a mans hardnesse and disobedience, it becommeth not the creature to quarrell with God, or dispute with God hereabout, because his weak capacity is not able to comprehend the reasonableness thereof. As for hardning by a will irresistible, implying that there may bee a kinde of hardning by a will resistible, as *Arminius* interpreteth the Apostle, it is to put upon the Apostle the conceits of man, for hee maketh no such distinction.

Secondly, Hee proceeds to shew how that God as the Creator, hath power over the creature to dispose of him as he thinks good, in two notable particulars. First, in making him, of what fashion hee will, *ver. 20.* Secondly, in making him to what end hee will, and that without controll from the creature (the one being answerable to the other) in these words: *Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why haste thou made mee thus?* Now these different conditions, as different fashions of a vessell, are to bee conceived in congruous reference to the double act of God formerly mentioned. First, the one was in shewing mercy on whom hee will, whereby a man is made a vessell of grace fit for honour. Secondly, the other was in hardning whom hee will, whereby a man left destitute of grace, is exposed to rebellion and disobedience and consequently made a vessell fit for dishonour.

Secondly, to what end hee will, to wit, either to honour or dishonour, that is, either to become finally a vessell of mercy, or a vessell of wrath, like as the potter disposeth of clay in making vessels thereof, answerable hereunto in each particular, according

according to the meere pleasure of his will.

Thirdly, hee sheweth that the end of all this is threefold.

1. The manifestation of his wrath or justice on the one.

2. The riches of his glory, that is, of his glorious grace on the vessels of mercy.

3. His power and sovereignty in making whom hee will vessels of wrath, or mercy.

Fourthly, hee shews withall, that before the execution of his wrath comes, hee suffers these vessels of wrath with long patience; implying both by this, and by this wrath, that the liberty of the creature in sinning, is nothing prejudiced in all this, and in the course of his patience, way is opened for his complaints and admonitions, and that in patheticall manner, unto these vessels of wrath to move them to repentance. For that God doth complain, and expostulate, and reprove for these their sinfull courses is most evident. And it is no lesse evident that when they goe on in their obstinate courses, not profiting by Gods Word and Works unto Repentance, the cause is (though no culpable cause) that God hath not given them a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to heare, from the first unto the last, *Deut. 29. 4.* That is, that both man runneth on wilfully in his sinfull courses, and that most culpably, and also that without grace it cannot bee otherwise. Though the reconciling of both these bee very obscure and difficult as indeed the providence of God especially in evil, and generally in working what hee will, by the free wills of the creature, is of a most mysterious nature. This patience of God comprehends not Gods bare suffering the wicked only, but his prospering of them also, *Jer. 12. 1.* Why are all they in wealth that rebelliously transgresse? 1. As for the first materiall point of the Apostles answer, I agree with you, in the explication thereof. 2. But as concerning the second, in my judgment there is nothing found.

For first, you feign the rigour of that which was objected to consist in a certain manner of Gods hardning: to wit, by his irresistible will; As if the Apostle did give us to understand, that there is a double kinde of hardning, that is imputed unto God. The one by his irresistible will; the other is not expressed by you, but intimated to consist in hardning by his will resistible, whereas no such distinction is either expressed or intimated by

the Apostle, neither doe you once goe about to prove it. And the distinction it self is very absurd; both in bringing in a will of God resistible, whereas the Apostle supposeth the will of God in hardning to bee irresistibile, without all distinction; neither doth hee give any the least intimation of a twofold hardning used by God, or imputable to him. Hee plainly professeth, that as *God hath mercy on whom hee will, so hee hardneth whom hee will, without all distinction.* And you may as well distinguish Gods shewing of mercy, as if that were twofold; one by his will resistible, another by his will irresistibile; For shewing mercy and hardning are made opposite by the Apostle. And it is a well known rule in Schooles, that *Quot modis dicitur unum oppositorum, tot modis dicitur & alterum*, of two opposites, look how many wayes the one is taken, so many wayes may the other bee taken. And upon this Doctrine of the Apostle, ariseth the objection to this effect. That seeing Gods will is irresistibile in hardning a man; it seems unreasonable that God should complain of such a mans rebellion and disobedience whom himselfe hath hardned, supposing that they cannot obey God who are hardned. And throughout this objection also, there is no colour of any such distinction as you introduce at pleasure, concerning Gods will, as either resistible or irresistibile, and accordingly as concerning the different manner of Gods obduration, to wit, either by his resistible will, or by his irresistibile will.

Secondly, you feign at pleasure in like manner, a denyall, or at least a mitigation of the rigour of St. Pauls former Doctrine, whence rose this objection. (for so I had rather expresse it, then as you doe, when in very obscure manner you call it the rigour of the word objected) And I wonder you would adventure to devise a denyall, or any colour of denyall made by the Apostle of that, which formerly hee delivered in saying, *Hee hath mercy on whom hee will, and whom hee will hee hardneth*; when your selfe have not hitherto manifested any minde to deny ought delivered by him, as it is not fit you should. But it may be the rigour mentioned by you, is not conceived to consist in Pauls former Doctrine of Gods hardning whom hee will, but rather in complaining of their disobedience whom God himselfe hath hardned, his will being irresistibile. Now this, though amplified as a rigorous thing, the Apostle may seem to deny, or at least mitigate.

But first it seems to mee, that the objection chargeth God not so much with a rigorous course, (for who shall hinder God to deal with any, as rigorously as pleaseth him, there being no injustice in rigour?) as with an unreasonable course. But whether rigorous or unreasonable in shew, the Apostle by saying God suffers them with long patience, doth neither deny, nor any way mitigate the condition of this course of his, for complaining of their disobedience, whom himself hath hardened. For albeit God all the day long, yea, and all the yeer long, yea, and many yeers long, stretcheth out his hands to a people that walk in a way that is not good, even after their own imaginations, such being the hardness of their hearts, as even in despite of Gods sufferance of them, and gracious proceedings with them, in the ministry of his word, and sparing them in his works also, yet if God himself continues to harden them, his will being irresistible, Gods complaining of their rebellion and disobedience, seems never a whit the lesse rigorous or unreasonable, according to the objection proposed. For as *Austin* saith, *Contra Julianum Pelag. lib. 5. cap. 4. Quamlibet praeberit patientiam, nisi Deus dederit, quis agat penitentiam?* though God afford never so great patience, yet unlesse God give [grace] who shall perform repentance? And to say that God doth harden by his long patience, is a strange liberty that you take in interpreting *Paul*: If to harden, bee to suffer with long patience, then to shew mercy, being opposite to hardning must bee not to suffer with long patience. And if to suffer with long patience bee to harden, then as often as hee suffers his own elect with long patience, hee hardneth them. And when *St. Peter* saith, *God is patient toward us*, the meaning in proportion must bee, hee hardens us. Let me tell you, that *Julian the Pelagian* of old, took the like advantage as you doe of the word *Patience* in this place to corrupt the Doctrine of *St. Paul*, *lib. 5. contr. Jul. Pelag. cap. 3. Quid est* (saith *Austin*) *quod dicitur, Exiis desiderijs suis traditi dicuntur, relictis per divinam patientiam intelligendi sunt, non per potentiam in peccata compulsi.* quasi non simul posuerit hec duo idem Apostolus; & patientiam & potentiam, ubi ait. Si autem ostendere volens iram & demonstrare potentiam suam, attulit in multa patientia, vasa ire, quae perfecta sunt in perditionem.: Quid horum tamen dicit esse quod scriptum est. Et propheta si erraverit & locutus fuerit, ego dominus seduxi prophetam illum; & extendam manum meam,

super eum, & exterminabo eum de medio populi mei Israel, patientia est, an patientia? Quod libet eligas vel utrumque fatearis, vides tamen falsa prophetam esse peccatum esse penamque peccati, An & hic dicturus es, quod ait, Ego dominus seduxi prophetam illum, intelligendum esse deserui, ut pro ejus meritis seductus erraret? Age ut vis, tamen eo modo punitus est pro peccato: ut falsum prophetando peccaret, sed illud innuere quod vidit Micheas propheta, Dominum sedentem super thronum suum, & omnis exercitus celi stabat circa eum, a dextris ejus, & a sinistris ejus. Et dixit dominus, Quis seducet Achab Regem Israelis, & ascendet & cadet in Ramoth Gilead? & dixit iste sic, & iste sic. Et exiit spiritus & stetit in conspectu Domini; & dixit, Ego seducam eum, Et dixit Dominus ad eum, inquit Es dixit, exibo, & ero spiritus mendax in ore omnium prophetarum ejus. Et dixit, Seduces & prevalebis, exi & fac sic. Quid ad ista dicturus es? Nempe Rex ipse peccavit falsis credendo prophetis. At hoc ipsa erat & pena peccati, Deo judicante, Deo mittente, angelum malum. Ut apertius intelligeremus, quomodo in psalmo dictum sit, Misisse iram indignationis sue, per angelos malos. Sed numquid errando, numquid injuste quicquam aut temere judicando, sive faciendo? Absit. Sed non frustra illi dictum est, Judicia tua sicut abyssus multa. Non frustra exclamat Apostolus, O altitudo divitiarum sapientie & scientie Dei! quam insondabilia sunt judicia ejus, & investigabiles vię ejus! Quis enim cognovit sensum Domini, aut quis consiliarius ejus fuit, aut quis prior dedit illi, ut retribuatur ei? And again in the same Chapter; Sequitur propter hoc, Tradidit illos Deus in passionem ignominie. Audis propter hoc, & queris insoniter quomodo intelligendus sit tradere Deus, multum laboravi, ut ostendas eum tradere deserendo: sed quomodo libet tradat, propter hoc tradidit. Propter hoc deseruit, & vides ejus traditionem, qualem libet, & quomodo libet intelligi, quę consecutę sunt. Curavi enim Apostolus dicere, quanta pena sit a Deo tradi passionibus ignominie, sive deserendo, sive alio quocunque, vel explicabit, vel inexplacabili modo quo facit hoc summe bonus, & ineffabiliter justus.

Thirdly, as touching the third, there is as little sounding in that also, for already you have confessed, that the Apostle in answering this objection, to justify God, hath recourse to Gods sovereignty over his creatures, as great as the potter hath over the clay, who maketh vessels of what fashion hee will, and to what end hee will. But in the last place you feign most unreason-

reasonably, a justification of Gods course in hardning whom hee will, from the consideration of the persons hardned, as being sinners. I say this is most unreasonable.

First, because when the creature is dealt withall according to his deserts, this alone is most sufficient and satisfactory to every one that acknowledgeth it, for the justification of any course taken with such. And it is meerly in vain to fly to any other course of justification, especially when it is lesse satisfactory then this. And how strange were it, that the Apostle should insist so fully and directly upon that other course of satisfaction, upon the consideration of Gods sovereignty, and should onely intimate this, and that obscurely, when this doth afford farre better satisfaction then the former.

Secondly, in this case, there were no ground for any such objection, nor any colour of unreasonableness, if God did but deale with them according to their deserts, as often as hee hardneth them.

Thirdly, the objection ariseth not upon Gods hardning a man simply, but upon the hardning of whom hee will, and that in a conjunct consideration, with his shewing mercy therewithall on whom hee will. In which case if God bee justified from the consideration of their conditions with whom hee deales, like as hee dealeth differently with them, in shewing mercy on some, and hardning others, so there should bee acknowledged a different condition, in the persons with whom God dealeth in so different a manner. But it is confessed by you, that the persons here in *St. Pauls* consideration are equal, with whom neverthelesse God deales very unequally.

Fourthly, though this bee a plausible course in the judgement of man, especially of the Arminians, for the smothering of the light of Gods truth in this place, yet when it is well considered, in the proper nature of it, I presume it will bee very dissonant unto common reason. For what I pray you is hardning in this place, standing in opposition to the shewing of mercy, but onely the denying of the grace of Faith and Repentance to them that heare the Gospel, like as to shew mercy is to give the grace of Faith and Repentance, as appeareth manifestly, both by the same phrase used, *Rom. 11. 30, 31.* and also by this very place clearing it self? For it is such an operation whereupon it will

follow, that God shall have cause or occasion to complain, as appeareth by the objection moved hereupon. Now I say, to deny Faith and Repentance is not of the nature of a punishment, neither can it bee said with sobriety, that man by sin doth deserve, that God should deny him faith and repentance, like as it cannot bee with sobriety affirmed, that man by being sick, hath deserved that the Physitian should not cure him: or that man being dead, hath deserved thereby that God should not raise him from death; whereas indeed a man could not bee raised from death, unlesse hee were first dead, nor cured unlesse first sick, neither were there any need of Faith in Christ crucified, and of repentance, unlesse man were a sinner.

Lastly, consider, as there is a grace of raising from out of sin, so there is a grace of preserving from sin. This grace God granted to the elect Angels, hee denied to the rest, meerly out of his own free pleasure, according to the Sovereignty hee hath over his creatures, and not with any reference unto sin preceding. For how was that possible? namely, that there could bee any sin found in Angels before their first sin? yet were the one, (to wit) the elect Angels *amplius adjui*, more succoured then the other, as *Austin* expressly professeth, *lib. 12. De Civ. Dei. cap. 9.* Indeed I finde *Ephes. 2. 3.* That wee are born children of wrath, in respect of sin, but that sin makes a man a vessell of wrath, or that hee is not a vessell of wrath till sin comes, the Apostle saith not; nay, the Apostle intimates the contrary, when hee represents the power of God over his creatures, by the power of the Potter over the Clay, in making therehence one vessell to honour, and another to dishonour. It is true, since the fall of *Adam*; man in his generation hath no being without sin; (for wee are even conceived in sin) yet it is not that sin, that makes a man a vessell of wrath, for if it did, then all should bee made by God vessells of wrath. But albeit the Apostle signifies that wee are all born children of wrath, which is verified in respect of the desert, even of sin originall, yet neither Apostle nor Prophet doth any where give us to understand, that all men are made vessells of wrath. This phrase includes, first, the intention of God like a Potter, to make such use of them, as to make his just wrath appeare upon them, and this purpose of God was everlasting, not onely as old as every mans generation, but as old

old as the creation of all, yea, and from everlasting before the Creation. Secondly, it includes also a fitnessse in the vessell for such an use, not fitnessse in the way of desert only; (such fitnessse being found in all the naturall sons of Adam) but fitnessse in respect of Gods purpose to shew wrath. Now like as in proportion hereunto, the making of a man fit for mercy, is the giving of him grace; so the denying of grace finally makes him fit for wrath in this sense, for as much as God will damn none but such as die in their sins. Here I speak of wrath and mercy, as they consist in giving salvation, or inflicting damnation.

Lastly, if none are ripened for destruction, till the refusall of meanes of grace, or the committing of grosse and unnaturall iniquity, then it followeth, that no Infants of Turks and Sarcens are vessels of wrath; No, nor men of ripe yeers amongst the heathen, many of whom never having either refused the means of grace (for as much as they never enjoyed them) and having lived civilly and morally all their dayes, Philosopher-like, free from grosse and unnaturall iniquity. And though all this bee granted you; yet if God to that end refuse to shew mercy on them, in giving them Faith and Repentance, and continues to harden them by denying such grace, look how rigorous or unreasonable soever the objection pretended Gods course to bee, in complaining of them for their disobedience, when God himself hath hardened them, in the same degree of rigour and unreasonableness, it continues still without all mitigation, notwithstanding all that you have said hitherto to the contrary.

Fourthly, as for the fourth, I have no desire to quarrell with you thereabout; Gods judgements indeed, *Rom. 11. 33.* that is, his *agendirationes* (as *Piscator* interpreteth it) are unsearchable, and his wayes past finding out. But you take a course quite contrary, to make them nothing unsearchable, but easie to be found out. For if obduration bee in respect of sin, surely there is no unsearchable depth in this. And in my opinion, the chief wayes of God, which the Apostle aims at in the place alledged, consists in having mercy on whom hee will, and hardning whom he will, and in generall thus in proportion to that which goeth before; There was a time when God had a Church without distinction of Jews and Gentiles, as before the Flood, and after,
till

till the bringing of the children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*: Again, there was a time after this, for about 1600. yeers, that God had a Church of the Jews in distinction from the Gentiles. And since that for the space of about 1600. yeers, God hath had a Church among the Gentiles in distinction from the Jews. And we look for a time to come when God shall have a Church, and that here on earth, consisting both of the Nation of the Jews, and of the Nations of the Gentiles. Three of these states are signified by the Apostle immediately before, *Rom. 11. 30.* For even as yee in time past, have not beleev'd God; yet have now obtained mercy, through their unbeliefe, there have wee two of them; one past, another then present: Then follows the third, *ver. 32.* Even so now have they not beleev'd by the mercy shew'd unto you; (this is part of the second) that they also may obtain mercy. This is the third, which wee look for, *ver. 32.* For God hath shew'd up all in unbeliefe, that hee might have mercy upon all. Then follows the exclamation, *ver. 33.* O the deepeesse of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God (for hee knows all courses possible to be taken, both wise and unwise, and out of the depth of his wisdom makes choyce of what hee thinks fit) O how unsearchable are his judgements, (for out of all these different courses, results such a splendor of the glory of God, as no creature (till it bee revealed) can project, nor devise any courses countervailable thereunto, when it is revealed) and his wayes past finding out!

FINIS.

9 AU 61

The English of the Latine passages in this Treatise,
in the severall Pages thereof, that are not
formerly engliſhed.

Page 10, lin. 2, 3, 4. *The Apoſtle ſaith that we are choſen in Chriſt, as in a Mediatour, by whoſe blond ſalvation is procured for us.* lin. 5. *As touching the act of God chooſing.* lin. 17, 18. *as in the head.* — *The nature of an head, is not the nature of a cauſe meritorious.* lin. 19, 20, 21. *The Apoſtle ſaith that we are elect in Chriſt, as in a Mediatour, by whoſe blond life is procured for us.* — 1. 21. *a meritorious cauſe.* lin. 22, 23, 24. *and as in an head, from whence theſe good things are derived to us. So that the reaſon of an head, is the reaſon of a meritorious cauſe, not morally, but naturally.* 1. 26. *as in the head.* 1. 27. *as dead and raiſed again.* 1. 37. *Chriſt is the head of the predeſtinate.*

Page 11, lin. 5, 6. *The other reaſon concerning Chriſt conſidered as the head, ſeemeth to depend on theſe parts.*

Page 12, 1. 5. *a thing being by accident.* 1. 28. *Predeſtination puts nothing in the thing predeſtinated.* 1. 31. *in all things.*

Page 13, lin. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. *By the comparing of which ſentence it appeares, that the Greek $\omega\kappa\alpha\tau\iota$ is here rightly rendred, among all. It is a Greek phraſe, leſt ſome one might conceive it ought to be tranſlated, in all; to wit, in all things. We are to remember, that the Apoſtle from this verſe began to diſcourſe of Chriſts kingdom in his Church, which no man will deny, if hee doth but lightly conſider the very words themſelves: and therefore under the univerſall particle, no other thing is comprehended, but all believers of all times. — Chriſt is the firſt of them that riſe again, that among all the Saints, both of them that went before and of them that came after, he might have the primacy of dignity, power, and holineſſe. — that ſo among all hee might have the preheminence; not onely in reſpect of men, but alſo of all angels.* lin. 23, 24, 25, 26. *that alwayes in every liſe he may be chiefe and principall: in grace and glory: in generation and reſurrection: as well in viſible as in inviſible creatures.*

Page 14, lin. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25. *If Chriſts predeſtination and ours be conſidered, as touching the act of God predeſtinating, ſo the one is not the cauſe of the other; for the ſame thing cannot be the cauſe of it ſelfe: but by the ſame divine act both Chriſt and we are predeſtinated; therefore the predeſtination of Chriſt is not the cauſe of our predeſtination. But if it be conſidered as touching the effect, ſeeing the effect of our predeſti-*

The Latine passages Englifhed.

predestination is grace and glory, and the adoption of ſonnes ; ſo it is to be ſaid, that the predeſtination of Chriſt is the cauſe of our predeſtination, both the cauſe efficient and the cauſe exemplary. l. 32. firſt. l. 33. latter.

Page 15. lin. 28, 29, &c. *a being by accident.*

Page 16. l. 14. *God only permitting them as they are evill. lin. 16, 17. not any thing comes to paſſe unleſſe God will have it come to paſſe, either by ſuffering it to come to paſſe, or himſelfe working it.*

Page 21. l. 3. *the reaſon whereof is derived from the reaſon of the end deſigned.*

Page 26. l. 10. *the reaſon of the end.*

Page 27. lin. laſt thirteen. 1. *Of all things which God from everlaſting did in his mind deviſe to doe, the firſt was the hypotaticall union of the divine Word. The ſecond was the predeſtination of all the elect. The third was the condition of the nature of things. And therefore ſupernaturals are before naturals ; and the order of nature preſuppoſeth the order of grace.*

2 *The fore-knowledge of no future thing is in the mind of God ſuppoſed to goe before predeſtination, but all things follow from it : and ſo far forth, that God decreed nothing at all from eternity to doe, nor in time doth, he permits nothing, or intends, whether naturall or ſupernaturall, whether it be of great weight, or of leaſt weight, or of no weight, which proceeds not there-hence, and is the effect and means of the predeſtination of the elect and of Chriſt. So that all things fall under the order of the divine predeſtination, as means ordained to the glory of Chriſt and of his Saints.*

Page 28. 3. *There is no other providence in God preceding predeſtination, ſo wit, from which providence proceed things naturall, and ſome other effects ſupernaturall ; but there is one onely providence, and that is predeſtination, from which all things throughout proceed, without all exception. So that according to this concluſion, the whole univerſe, as it comprehends things naturall and ſupernaturall, things good and evill, ſubſtances and accidents, and all wayes throughout of being and working, not onely in generall, but in ſpeciall and individwall, are to be conſidered as the onely totall object of divine predeſtination ; ſo that not any one thing is without the breadth of its object, and which falls not under that act of predeſtination.*

4. *If there had not been a predeſtination of Gods elect, nothing at all had been in the nature of things. Therefore I hold this as certaine, that unleſſe Chriſt had been to come into the world, there had been no predeſtination of the elect made by God ; and if no predeſtination had been, by verſue whereof all things follow, there ſhould have been neither heaven, nor earth, nor other elements, nor living things, nor men, nor angels, nor ſins, nor devils, nor reprobates ; and laſt of all, that I may conclude in one word,*

God

The Latine passages Englished.

God alone had been, and nothing else had been besides God, neither naturall nor supernaturall, neither good nor evil; we speak according to the common law and order of things, and according to those ends which probably we conceive God to have had in the making of creatures. For our purpose is not at all so to tie the majesty of the divine power to the weakness of our apprehensions, to deny that God could (such is his absolute power) make and ordaine the nature of things without dependance upon grace and glory, and grace without dependance upon Christ our Lord.

Pag. *ibid.* five last lines. Behold where, look by what reason Christ is said to be Gods, and the predestinate are said to be Christs; by the same reason all naturall things, whether present or to come, whether life or death, are said to be the predestinates owne things: But so it is, that Christ is therefore said to be Gods, and the elect are said to be Christs, because

Pag. 29. God is the end of Christ, and Christ is the end of the elect; that is, because Christ is ordained unto God as unto the end, and the elect unto Christ, as unto the end: and unlesse hee, that is, God, were the first end, or the manifestation of his glory, there should be no Christ; and if there were no Christ, there should be no elect: therefore altogether by the same reason, the creatures are therefore said to be theirs who are elect, because they are for the elect, and the elect are the ends of them; and so if the elect should not have been, no natures of the creatures should have been.

Pag. *ibid.* l. 9, 10, &c. He hath chosen us in him before the constitution of the world. Now hee speaks of Christ man, to wit, of Christ the head, as Hierome expreth upon that place, and it appears most plainly by the text. Certainly, either I am deceived, or Saint Paul intends not that onely, to wit, that God hath chosen us in Christ, before the true and reall constitution of the world, which was made in time now six thousand yeares agoe. For that God had chosen us in Christ before the temporall creation of all things, was no great thing, nor worthy of so great a pen; for so he chose oxen and stones: For he decreed them, and fore-saw them, before the creation of things in time, or before he made any thing in time; now before the constitution of the world, and from everlasting he devised them, and determined to make them. Therefore Paul intends some higher and more divine matter; to wit, that God in his eternity, when he devised with himselfe the creation of the world, even before that in order of reason he devised with himselfe concerning the election of his elect; and even then (I say) he had intended and fore-seen Christ, and in him he had chosen the predestinate. — lin. 27, 28, &c. a most efficacious reason; Every one willing things ordinately, first willet the end; and of means those means which are nearer to the end: But Christ and the predestinate, and therefore all supernaturals are nearer to the end, that is, to the manifestation

The Latine passages Englished.

- of the divine goodnesse, than all naturall things; therefore supernaturals are willed by God before naturals; and the manifestation of the goodnesse of God before them all; because we consider it as the end of all. — lin. 37,38. After what order and manner things are determined with God.
- Pag. 30. lin. 6. to 15. Thomas is of opinion, that Christ should never have been predestinated if man had not sinned. Whence it seemeth to follow by consequence, that sinne was first seen by God, and the permission thereof willed, before the incarnation of the Word was willed: So that in the way of the Thomists, it appeares not how it can stand, that the first decree of God was the incarnation or predestination of the Word, if so be the permission and fore-sight of sin was before it: but if Christ were predestinate before sin was fore-seen, then though sin had not been yet Christ should have come into the world, who was predestinate before the fore-sight of sin. lin. 30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38. That God did first will the hypostaticall union and incarnation of the Word, before he willed the permission of sin, and before he determined to make the nature of man, and of the whole universe — Yet because the incarnation was not willed without the consideration of sin, but was willed dependently upon the permission of sin, and of the nature of things, as upon the meanes; therefore it followeth not, that Christ should come into the world if sinne had not entred, or if the world had not at all been. — means tending to the incarnation of Christ.
- Pag. 32. l. 20. From the greatnesse of the remedy, take notice of the greatnesse of the danger.
- Pag. 36. l. 26. beyond the worthinesse of it. l. 27. lesse then it deserves.
- Pag. 40. l. 4. who by profiting write, and by writing profit. l. 16. the masse not made. l. 17. made — not yet corrupted. l. 18. the masse corrupt.
- Pag. 41. lin. 23. the masse not yet created. l. 28. the masse corrupt.
- Pag. 43. lin. 34,35. God willed glory unto Peter, he willed nothing unto Judas. l. 36. God willed grace unto Peter, he willed nothing unto Judas. — l. 37. God would have each of them to exist in the corrupt masse.
- Pag. 44. l. 2. It is something to come thus farre. l. 4. will damnation unto Judas. l. 14. of every thing that is, and of every thing that is not. l. 33, 34. If God did not will glory to Judas, then God did will that hee should have no glory.
- Pag. 45. l. 13. to hate. l. 14. not to will grace and glory to some one.
- Pag. 47. l. 23. as a crown of justice.
- Pag. 51. l. 25, 26. Reprobation includes the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for sin.
- Pag. 53. l. 22. We know. l. 23. not onely wills averse from faith, but wills ad-verse to faith. l. 29. Of the vocation of the Gentiles.
- Pag. 54. l. 20. in the masse from the beginning corrupt.

The Latine passages Englished.

- Page 55. l. 34. *in the masse of Adam.* lin. 36, 37. *to consider, — to erre or feign.*
lin. 27, 28. *as to come in the masse of Adam.*
- Page 56. lin. 5, 6. *as should be faithfull, and repent, and persevere in faith and repentance.*
- Page 59. lin. 13, 14. *Let me not live if I delight in the death of a wicked man ; but I delight when a wicked man returns, that hee may live.* lin. 21, 22. *Because our defections and our sins lye upon us, therefore we pine away in them, and should we live.* lin. 24, 25, 26. *Say unto them, Let me not live, saith the Lord, if I delight in the death of the wicked, but when the wicked returnes from his way, that hee may live. Returne ye, returne ye from your most evill wayes ; for why should ye die, O house of Israel ?*
- Page 60. lin. 3, 4. *by almighty facility convert,* — *and of unwilling make them willing ?* lin. 38. *the will of signe,* — *the will of good pleasure ;* l. 39. *the will of precept.*
- Page 61. l. 1. *the will of purpose.* l. 14. *the will of sign, and the will of good pleasure.*
- Page 62. l. 18. *as touching the act of God willing.* l. 19. *as touching the things ^{so} willed*
- Page 67. l. 20. *the decrees being changed the Court of heaven had mourned.* lin. 24. *in a greater measure succoured.*
- Page 68. lin. 23, 24. *Not any thing comes unlesse God will have it come to passe, either by suffering it to come to passe, or himselfe working it.* l. 25. *suffers to come to passe, hee will have it come to passe.*
- Page 69. l. 11. *middle knowledge.* l. 21. *in part.* lin. 22. *simply, or thoroughly.*
- Page 71. l. 2, 3. *the pride of man is wont to say, If I had known it, I would have done it.*
- Page 72. l. 32. *This is an hard saying.*
- Page 76. l. 1, 2, &c. *Each part of man (the spirit and the heart, that is the superiour and inferiour) ill disposed by God, understand it negatively, as touching the giving of free grace, but positively, as touching the judgement, inclination to, and prosecution of a sensible good. So that God made the Kings spirit hard (that is, not yeelding to the requests made) and not giving him grace to yeeld, and working with him to the affection of security, and his own good.*
- Page 77. lin. 31, 32. *by works,* — *by writing.*
- Page 78. li. 16, 17. *How great patience soever God affords, who will repent unlesse God give repentance ?*
- Page 79. l. 11, 12. *that they may profit so farre, as to performe outward repentance, that so their punishment may be the lesse.* l. 24, 25. *by will of precept,* — *by will of purpose or good pleasure.*
- Page 82. l. 4. *that hee might afflict thee.* l. 28. *of duty.* — *by conformity to the affections of men.*

The Latine passages Englished.

Pag. 86. l. 6, 7. *Fair Laverna, teach me to deceive, teach me to seem just and holy: Cast darknesse over my sins, and a cloud over my deceits.*

lin. 38, 39. *Liberty without grace is not liberty, but wilfulnesse.*

Pag. 89. l. 3. *doe that which is just.* l. 4. *because they will not. — why will they not?*

l. 5. *we goe farre, — without prejudice of a more diligent search,* l. 6, 7. *Either because the goodnesse of it lies hid, or because 'tis such as delights not.* l. 8. *but that, what lay hid is made known, and that is made sweet which formerly did not delight, this is from the grace of God which succoureth mens wills.* l. 34, 35. *averse from true faith, but adverse to true faith.*

Pag. 94. l. 27, 28. *whom no mans will resists; — for of unwilling he makes them willing.* l. 32, 33. *the pride of man is wont to say, Had I known it, I would have done it.*

Pag. 95. l. 5, 6. *faith is the cause of salvation. — cause meritorious.* l. 7. *cause of damnation. — causes disposing.*

Pag. 97. l. 3. *Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag. 99. l. 34. *Justice of condecency.*

Pag. 105. l. 29. *university of elect. — a world of elect.* l. 30. *Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag. 108. l. 10. *the will cannot be constrained.* lin. 15, 16. *God by almighty ease converts men, and of unwilling makes them willing.*

Pag. 109. l. 21. *in the masse at the first corrupt.*

Pag. 111. l. 24. *of former and latter.*

Pag. 114. lin. 31, 32. *includes the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for sin.* l. 36. *the criticall point.*

Pag. 115. l. 33. *the outward works of the Trinity are indivisible.*

Pag. 121. l. 2. *such as should be saved.*

Pag. 122. l. 1, 2. *they encreased the errorr concerning God. — they took away the feare of God.*

Pag. 125. l. 11, 12. *into a mind void of all judgement.* l. 20. *from the beginning.*

Pag. 127. l. 10. *of old fore-written to this judgement.*

Pag. 129. l. 28. *the pure masse.* l. 29. *the corrupt masse.*

Pag. 132. l. 38. *suirs at law.*

Pag. 133. lin. 31, 32, 33. *moreover this metaphor is taken from hence, that Gods eternall, whereby the believers are ordained to salvation, is called a book.*

Pag. 137. l. 24. *righteousnesse of condecency.*

Pag. 140. l. 20, 21. *The love of good liking. — the love of wel-doing.*

Pag. 141. l. 10. *the will of the flesh.* l. 25. *to an outward amendment of life.*

Pag. 146. l. 11. *is not liberty, but contumacy.*

Pag. 147. l. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *what patience soever God shewes, yet who shall repent unlesse God gives repentance. — None of these whom God hath not predestinated, doth God bring unto true and wholsome repentance, whereby*

The Latine passages Englished

whereby man is reconciled unto God in Christ, whether hee affords them greater patience, or as great. — God brings to repentance; but whom? whom hee hath predestinated

Pag. 185. lin. 9, 10. more helped. 1. 11, 12. to be able if hee would. — to will what he could. 1. 13. helps or succours.

Pag. 187. l. 12. as touching the act of God predestinating. 1. 23. as touching the act of God reprobating. 1. 25. as touching the act of God willing.

Pag. 191. l. 4. not by infusing malice or naughtinesse, but by not infusing grace.

Pag. 193. l. 15. no man becomes most foule at first. 1. 18. No old man fears God.

Pag. 195. lin. 21, 22. The same, as the same, alwayes works the same.

Pag. 202. l. 12. unequal beifers are not fit to plough under the same yoke.

Pag. 203. l. 17. by infusing malice, but by not infusing grace.

Pag. 205. l. 3. not as touching the affection, 1. 4. but as touching the effect.

Pag. 212. l. 15. In the generall lurk many equivocations.

Pag. 224. lin. 27, 28, 29. Thou art under the wrath of God, — therefore worship God who is easie to be intreated. For upon thy prayers hee will pardon thee, and his anger will be appeased.

Pag. 227. l. 27. of duty, not of fact.

Pag. 229. lin. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. To God, without doubt, look how easie it is to doe what he will, as easie it is not to suffer that to be which he will not have to be. Unlesse we believe this, wee must renounce the first article of our Creed, whereby wee profess to believe in God the Father, who is almighty. For he is not called omnipotent, but to shew, that whatsoever hee will doe, that he can doe; neither can the effect of an almighty power be hindered, by the will of any creature.

Pag. 230. lin. 28, 29. Exhortation not made, but despised. 1. 32. if I had known it, I would have done it; — if I had heard, I would have believed.

Pag. 232. l. 33. on Gods part, — on mans part.

Pag. 258. lin. 7, 8. O Roman, thou dost undeservedly suffer for the sins of thine Ancestors.

Pag. 262. lin. 31, 32. that they may profit to the outward amendment of their life, to the end that their punishment may be the milder.

Pag. 263. l. 24. the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for their sin.

Pag. 283. lin. 31, &c. what is this that you say, [when they are said to be given over to their lusts, they are to be understood, as men left by divine patience, not compelled into sins by Gods power] as if the Apostle had not put both these together, both patience and power, when hee saith, But if, God willing to shew wrath, and demonstrate his power, suffered in much patience the vessels of Gods wrath, fitted, or prepared, for destruction. Yet which of these two doe you say is that which is written? And the Prophet if hee shall erre, and speake, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet: and I will stretch

The Latine passages Englished.

Pag. 86. l. 6, 7. *Fair Laverna, teach me to deceive, teach me to seem just and holy :
Cast darknesse over my sins, and a cloud over my deceits.*

lin. 38, 39. *Liberty without grace is not liberty, but wilfulnesse.*

Pag. 89. l. 3. *doe that which is just. l. 4. because they will not. — why will they not ?*

l. 5. *we goe farre, — without prejudice of a more diligent search, l. 6, 7. Either because the goodnesse of it lies hid, or because 'tis such as delights not. l. 8. but that, what lay hid is made known, and that is made sweet which formerly did not delight, this is from the grace of God which succoureth mens wills. l. 34, 35. averse from true faith, but adverse to true faith.*

Pag. 94. l. 27, 28. *whom no mans will resists ; — for of unwilling he makes them willing. l. 32, 33. the pride of man is wont to say, Had I known it, I would have done it.*

Pag. 95. l. 5, 6. *faith is the cause of salvation. — cause meritorious. l. 7. cause of damnation. — causes disposing.*

Pag. 97. l. 3. *Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag. 99. l. 34. *Justice of condecency.*

Pag. 105. l. 29. *university of elect. — a world of elect. l. 30. Of the vocation of Gentiles.*

Pag. 108. l. 10. *the will cannot be constrained. lin. 15, 16. God by almighty ease converts men, and of unwilling makes them willing.*

Pag. 109. l. 21. *in the masse at the first corrupt.*

Pag. 111. l. 24. *of former and latter.*

Pag. 114. lin. 31, 32. *includes the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for sin. l. 36. the criticall point.*

Pag. 115. l. 33. *the outward works of the Trinity are indivisible.*

Pag. 121. l. 2. *such as should be saved.*

Pag. 122. l. 1, 2. *they encreased the errorr concerning God. — they took away the feare of God.*

Pag. 125. l. 11, 12. *into a mind void of all judgement. l. 20. from the beginning.*

Pag. 127. l. 10. *of old fore-written to this judgement.*

Pag. 129. l. 28. *the pure masse. l. 29. the corrupt masse.*

Pag. 132. l. 38. *snits at law.*

Pag. 133. lin. 31, 32, 33. *moreover this metaphor is taken from hence, that Gods eternall, whereby the believers are ordained to salvation, is called a book.*

Pag. 137. l. 24. *righteousnesse of condecency.*

Pag. 140. l. 20, 21. *The love of good liking. — the love of wel-doing.*

Pag. 141. l. 10. *the will of the flesh. l. 25. to an outward amendment of life.*

Pag. 146. l. 11. *is not liberty, but continuacy.*

Pag. 147. l. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *what patience soever God shewes, yet who shall repent unlesse God gives repentance. — None of these whom God hath not predestinated, doth God bring unto true and wholsome repentance, whereby*

The Latine passages Englished.

whereby man is reconciled unto God in Christ, whether hee affords them greater patience, or as great. — God brings to repentance; but whom? whom hee hath predestinated

Pag. 185. lin. 9, 10. more helped. 1. 11, 12. to be able if hee would. — to will what he could. 1. 13. helps or succours.

Pag. 187. l. 22. as touching the act of God predestinating. 1. 23. as touching the act of God reprobating. 1. 25. as touching the act of God willing.

Pag. 191. l. 4. not by infusing malice or naughtinesse, but by not infusing grace.

Pag. 193. l. 15. no man becomes most foule at first. 1. 18. No old man fears God.

Pag. 195. lin. 21, 22. The same, as the same, alwayes works the same.

Pag. 202. l. 12. unequal heifers are not fit to plough under the same yoke.

Pag. 203. l. 17. by infusing malice, but by not infusing grace.

Pag. 205. l. 3. not as touching the affection, 1. 4. but as touching the effect.

Pag. 212. l. 15. In the generall lurk many equivocations.

Pag. 224. lin. 27, 28, 29. Thou art under the wrath of God, — therefore worship God who is easie to be intreated. For upon thy prayers hee will pardon thee, and his anger will be appeased.

Pag. 227. l. 27. of duty, not of fact.

Pag. 229. lin. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. To God, without doubt, look how easie it is to doe what he will, as easie it is not to suffer that to be which he will not have to be. Unlesse we believe this, wee must renounce the first article of our Creed, whereby wee profess to believe in God the Father, who is almighty. For he is not called omnipotent, but to shew, that whatsoever hee will doe, that he can doe; neither can the effect of an almighty power be hindered, by the will of any creature.

Pag. 230. lin. 28, 29. Exhortation not made, but despised. 1. 32. if I had known it, I would have done it; — if I had heard, I would have believed.

Pag. 232. l. 33. on Gods part, — on mans part.

Pag. 258. lin. 7, 8. O Roman, thou dost undeservedly suffer for the sins of thine Ancestors.

Pag. 262. lin. 31, 32. that they may profit to the outward amendment of their life, to the end that their punishment may be the milder.

Pag. 263. l. 24. the will of suffering sin, and inflicting damnation for their sin.

Pag. 283. lin. 31, &c. what is this that you say, [when they are said to be given over to their lusts, they are to be understood, as men left by divine patience, not compelled into sins by Gods power] as if the Apostle had not put both these together, both patience and power, when hee saith, But if, willing to shew wrath, and demonstrate his power, suffered in much patience the vessels of Gods wrath, fitted, or prepared, for destruction. Yet which of these two doe you say is that which is written? And the Prophet if hee shall erre, and speake, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet: and I will stretch

The Laine passages Englisied

stretch out mine arme upon him, and cut him off out of the midst of my people Israel. Is this patience, or power? choose which you will, or confesse both. Yet you see, that the sin of him who prophecyeih falsly, is also a punishment of sin. And when it is said, I the Lord haue deccerved that Prophet: will you say here also, that this is to be understood as if it were said, I have deserted him, that by reason of his merits he is seduced that he might erre? Be it so, if you will; yet after this manner he was punished for his sins, that by prophecying that which was false hee might sin. But look unto that which the Prophet Micheas saw, to wit, The Lord sitting upon his throne, and the whole army of heaven stood about him, on his right hand, and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall perswade Ahab the King of Israel, that he may goe up and fall at Ramoth Gilead? and one spake on this manner, and another on that. And there came forth a Spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will perswade him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-wit? And he said, I will goe forth, and will be a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets. But this very thing was also a punishment of sin; God judging, God sending an evill Angel: That wee may more clearly understand, how it is said in the Psalmes, that hee sent the wrath of his indignation by evill Angels. But did God erre in this? did he judge or doe ought unjustly or rashly in this? Farre be it from us so to think. But the Prophet spake not in vaine, when hee said, Thy judgements are a great depth. The Apostle doth not cry out in vaine, when hee saith, O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgements; and his wayes past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his Counsellour? or who first gave unto him, that hee might be recompensed? And againe, in the same Chapter it followeth; For this cause God gave them over to the lusts of uncleannesse. You heare, that for this God gave them over; and you vainly inquire, How it is to be understood, that God gave them over? taking much paines to shew, that God gives men over in such manner, by deserting them: But after what manner soever God gives them over, for this cause God gave them over: For this hee deserted them. And you see Gods giving of them over, what kind of desertion soever it be, and after what manner soever you understand the things which followed hereupon. For the Apostles care was to shew, how great a punishment it is, to be given over of God to the lusts of uncleannesse, whether by forsaking them, or after what other manner soever; whether explicable or inexplicable, whereby God doth this, who is both good and just in an unspeakable manner.

FINIS. 9 AU 61

